THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL

dealing with Race and Inheritance in the Fields of

ETHNOLOGY · ETHNO- AND HUMAN GENETICS

ETHNO-PSYCHOLOGY · RACIAL HISTORY

DEMOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPO-GEOGRAPHY

Vol. IV, No. 1 · July-September 1963

6s · $1.25

AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Pasadena, California

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serving *a critical function* in psychology . . .

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD

a quarterly journal of

theoretical and experimental articles reflecting a wide range of reader interest, new approaches, critiques and commentary on current developments.

Regular subscription, $4.00 per year

Mail subscriptions to:

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD
DENISON UNIVERSITY · GRANVILLE · OHIO

GENUS

The Review of the ITALIAN COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF POPULATION PROBLEMS *and of the* ITALIAN SOCIETY OF GENETICS AND EUGENICS. *Edited under the auspices of the National Research Council.*

EDITOR : CORRADO GINI

Genus accepts scientific articles, papers, notes and communications written in Italian, English, French, German and Spanish in the field of the different sciences related to population problems (Demography, Sociology, Economics, General Biology, Genetics, Eugenics, Anthropology, Social Hygiene, Psychology, Geography).

3000 Lire U.S. $6.00

Orders should be addressed to: SEGRETERIA DEL COMITATO ITALIANO PER LO STUDIO DEI PROBLEMI DELLA POPOLAZIONE—Via delle Terme di Diocleziano, 10—ROMA, ITALIA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. IV, NO. 1 THE JULY-SEPTEMBER 1963

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

— mala opinio bene parta delectet —

EDITOR
R. GAYRE OF GAYRE, M.A., D.Phil., D.Pol.Sc., D.Sc.

HONORARY ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Professor HENRY E. GARRETT, Ph.D., D.Sc.
Professor CORRADO GINI, LL.D., D.Soc., D.Sc., D.Econ., D.Soc.Sc.

ASSISTANT EDITORS
A. JAMES GREGOR, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.
ROBERT KUTTNER, B.S., Ph.D.
ROBERT H. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.G.S.
DONALD A. SWAN, B.A.

HONORARY ADVISORY BOARD
Professor Santiago Alcobé, Barcelona, Spain; Professor P. C. Biswas, Delhi, India; Professor Alberto Xavier da Cunha, Coimbra, Portugal; Professor A. P. Elkin, Sydney, Australia; Professor Luigi Gedda, Rome, Italy; Professor Dr E. Hanhart, Zurich, Switzerland; Professor J. D. J. Hofmeyr, Pretoria, South Africa; Dr Watson Kirkconnell, Wolfville, Canada; Dr Taku Komai, Kyoto, Japan; Professor Bertil Lundman, Uppsala, Sweden; Professor Frank C. J. McGurk, Villanova, Penn., U.S.A.; Professor Branimiro Males, Tucuman, Argentina; His Excellency Professor Gaetano Martino, Rome, Italy; Dr Clarence P. Oliver, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.; Professor S. D. Porteus, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.; Professor Heinrich Quiring, Berlin, West Germany; Dr David C. Rife, New Delhi, India; Professor M. R. Sahni, Panjab, India; Professor Herbert Sanborn, Tennessee, U.S.A.; Dr John Scudder, New York, U.S.A.; Professor Sergio Sergi, Rome, Italy; Dr Audrey M. Shuey, Lynchburg, Va., U.S.A.; Professor M. J. Sirks, Groningen, Netherlands; Professor Torsten Sjögren, Stockholm, Sweden; Professor Dudley Stamp, Bude Haven, England; Professor Charles C. Tansill, Washington, U.S.A.; Professor Giovanni Tucci, Naples, Italy; Professor Harry Turney-High, Columbia, S.C., U.S.A.; Professor H. V. Vallois, Paris, France; Dr R. J. Walsh, Sydney, Australia.

Published by
THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

Editorial Offices:
1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh 3, Scotland
Subscription Offices:
102 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. IV, NO. 1 JULY-SEPTEMBER 1963

CONTENTS

THE BANTU AND EUROPEAN OCCUPATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA
by T. S. van Rooyen 3

THESE ARE THE GUILTY
by Carleton Putnam 12

COMMENTS ON THE TEACHINGS OF CARLETON PUTNAM
by Dwight J. Ingle 28

A REPLY TO DWIGHT INGLE
by Carleton Putnam 43

A NOTE ON THE REACTIONS OF A FAMILY LIVING IN A FALLOUT SHELTER
by Henry H. Reiter 49

BOOK REVIEWS 51

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BANTU AND EUROPEAN OCCUPATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA

By T. S. van ROOYEN

One of our readers has taken the Editor to task for referring, in "The Bantu Homelands of the Northern Transvaal" (THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. III, No. 2, p. 10), to the entry of the Bantu into South Africa from the north as the Whites entered from the south. This passage was not meant to infer exact contemporaneity. The fact of the matter is that whereas Caucasoids have penetrated to the north of South Africa and beyond into Rhodesia, the Bantu did not settle *all* of South Africa but stopped short of the southern part. In that sense the Europeans were the first to cover the whole country. But the inference intended in the article was that both Caucasoids and Bantu are not long-established natives of Southern Africa. Indigenous peoples were there before them—the Hottentots and Bushmen who, driven south by the invading Bantu and compressed from the south by the incoming Whites, have well-nigh succumbed. In point of fact, of course, the first Bantu had crossed the frontiers from the north into what is now the Republic of South Africa before the Whites arrived. They came down from West Africa, and reached the Congo at periods variously put at between the twelfth and seventeenth centuries. An offshoot of this movement reached South Africa, as far as Natal, by what is estimated as the fourteenth century. In other words the ancestors of, for instance, the Zulus had reached South Africa two centuries before the Portuguese were rounding the Cape, and three centuries before the Dutch settled there. But they never came on into the Cape. When the clash eventually took place between the Whites (the Africaaners, and later the British) and the Bantu Matabele and Zulus in the nineteenth century, it was between peoples who themselves had only tenuous and recent occupation of parts of the country, or who were already settled in it, with rights of established occupation, whichever view is taken. But the fact remains that the Bantu were as much intrusive into South Africa as were the Whites, and they did not settle the *whole* of the country, as there were none in the south. From the point of view of ethnic history the priority of tenure of the Bantu in South Africa in the regions from Natal to the Transvaal over the Whites at the Cape is negligible. It is, therefore, true to say that the Bantu are late comers to South Africa, although we did not intend to infer that the Dutch arrived quite as early as the Bantu.

Some people are led to believe that the civilisation of Zimbadwe was "native," and so Bantu, because it is estimated to have been well established as early as the seventh century. This, however, is a mistaken idea. As far as we can see it was Ethiopic, based perhaps on some kind of Hottentot foundation. In other words it was due to the intrusive Ethiopic racial breed which we believe was derived from an ancient cross between Caucasoid and Negroid. It was this culture which fortified Zimbadwe—where they exploited

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the gold of the region and exported it for many centuries from there to India. The invasion of the aggressive Bantu overthrew this civilisation and its people.

Dr van Rooyen continues the ethnic history of the clash between the Bantu and the Whites in this article on the occupation of South Africa.

—EDITOR.

The statement one sometimes hears, that the Bantu of the Republic of South Africa settled in their various homelands at approximately the same time as the European penetration of the interior of South Africa took place, is not based on historical fact. At the same time, however, it must be pointed out that the *stress* laid on the fact that Bantu tribes had already settled in certain regions of Southern Africa prior to the coming of the White man has the erroneous implication that most of Southern Africa was regarded by the various Bantu tribes as belonging to them, and that in fact, there was a peaceful and uniform occupation of the surface area of the country until such time as they were bereft of their rightful heritage by the intrusion of the white man who, without regard to the question of sovereign right, forced the various Bantu tribes into scattered location areas. Both points of view—the concurrence in time, and the principle of priority over a vast area—are not based on historical fact but rather reflect a superficial acceptance of political doctrine and point of view. Both are used as arguments in which divergent and opposite political doctrines are reflected and both are, historically speaking, incorrect.

The Cape Colony

There can today be no further argument about the right of priority claimed by the White man over the area from Cape Town, where the first White settlers landed in 1652, to the Fish River along the Eastern seaboard where the southward migratory movement of the Nguni people—the Xhosa—was checked by the boundary agreement between the Dutch governor, van Plettenberg, and the Xhosa chiefs on the banks of this river. The penetration of the White man into what is today known as the Orange Free State, Natal and the Transvaal has, however, raised the question of priority or concurrence in time with its concomitant question of sovereignty.

The Orange Free State

The movement of the White man across the Orange River, the Northern boundary of the Cape Colony, is regarded by both English and Afrikaans historians as a political movement resulting from dissatisfaction felt by the Dutch farmers for British policy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in general. The penetration of the area known as the Orange Free State, Natal and the Transvaal was therefore accomplished by organised groups with the sole aim of founding an independent state or states in the interior. Before they left the colony investigation committees were sent into the interior, and it was as a result of their findings that Pieter Retief, one of their leaders, set out their aims in the *Grahamstown Journal* of the 2nd of February 1837 in which he, *inter alia,* stated: "We shall in no way take away any land from anybody," thereby implying that there were unoccupied areas in the interior to which no one laid claim.

When these White men arrived in the Orange Free State they found an isolated Bantu tribe, the Barolong, who had been forced southward by the Matabele from the Transvaal into the foothills of the Maluti mountains and settled at a place called Thaba 'Nchu under their chief Morôka. Other smaller tribes that had been driven southward across the flat open country of Bechuanaland and Southern Transvaal by the marauding Matabele of South Western Transvaal had taken refuge in the Maluti mountains where the astute Moshesh began to organise them into the well known Basuto people of Basutoland. A few scattered tribal groups like the Bataung under Makawaan, and the Botlôkwa, lived northward along the banks of the Sand River and the Wilge River, later the district of Harrismith. During 1831 the area between the Vaal River and the Maluti mountains was so to say denuded of any population by the destruction wrought by the Matabele under Mzilikazi which swept them into the Maluti mountains, where the Matabele were turned back by Moshesh in front of his mountain stronghold of Thaba Bosigo.

North of Thaba 'Nchu the White Trekkers found Makwana, destitute chief of the Bataung, at the Vet River. He gladly sold the area between the Vet and Vaal Rivers to the White newcomers on condition that they formed an effective buffer between the Matabele and his people. During September 1836 the Matabele again struck across the Vaal River and unexpectedly attacked the European settlers at a place called Vegkop. The attackers were beaten off but the White settlers or Trekkers lost all their cattle, a fact which had far reaching consequences for the Matabele later on, because they were subsequently attacked by the Trekkers with the help of the Barolong of Thaba 'Nchu, and were driven north of the Limpopo River. Thereupon treaties were signed between the few scattered Bantu tribes in the Orange Free State, the Basuto of Moshesh, and the Trekkers, whereby the various tribal areas were agreed upon and the boundary between the Orange Free State and Basutoland was settled.

The Trekkers in the Orange Free State accepted sovereignty over the whole area, because the few scattered tribes were destitute, even to such an extent that cannibalism had occurred amongst

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, and also because the tribes wished it on condition that their tribal grounds remained inviolate. The Basutos under Moshesh, who lived up in the fastnesses of the Maluti mountains, retained their independence, but boundaries were drawn by common agreement between the two parties. In later years differences arose as to the interpretation of where the boundaries in fact lay. These led to the well known Basuto wars which occupied the attention of British as well as Dutch statesmen and which eventually led to the annexation of Basutoland by the British but not to the dispossession of the Basuto tribal lands.

The Transvaal

Before the coming of the Matabele under Mzilikazi to the Transvaal, the Mantatese ravaged the North-Western Transvaal and, according to anthropologists and others, exterminated no less than twenty-eight tribes. The Zulus from Natal raided the Eastern Transvaal areas while the Matabele, who were in fact a breakaway section of the Zulus, moved across Eastern Transvaal into Central Transvaal and thereafter, as a result of their fear for the Zulus, into Western Transvaal. While the Matabele were still in the Eastern Transvaal they raided the area up to the Limpopo River and beyond. The scattered Bantu tribes fled or withdrew into the mountains or forested mountain valley country. They lost the greater part of their herds of cattle to the raiders and were at the same time hardly able to win food from the soil. The extent of their suffering may be gauged from the fact that many were forced into cannibalism. Thus for instance the Koni of the Eastern Transvaal were called *Matchema*—"they who eat people." Alexander Merensky, the German missionary of the Berlin Mission who came to the Transvaal in 1859 and made an intensive study of the various tribes of Transvaal, and who at the same time had no love for the Transvaal Dutch, wrote in 1880 in a letter to Sir Theophilus Shepstone, "It is true that before the arrival of the Boers the Natives of the Transvaal were entirely routed and dispossessed of their respective territories . . . this was the case in the northern districts as well as southern."

The White Trekkers, who had moved into the Transvaal under their leader A. H. Potgieter, moved into the vacuum created by the raids of the Mantatese, the Zulus and the Matabele, as well as by the internecine wars waged between the smaller tribes. After Mzilikazi and his Matabele were driven across the Limpopo River, the White Trekkers could have proclaimed their sovereignty over Transvaal according to the simple principle of right of conquest. This is in fact what happened and chiefs like Mogalie, Magotla, Maselon, Pilani, Rametlape and others in their messages to the White newcomers accepted this principle. At the same time the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle was accepted, according to the first Constitution of the Transvaal of the 9th of April 1844 which was incorporated into later Constitutions, that the lands of the various tribal groups within the borders of the Transvaal were to remain inviolate. The tribes had to promise that they would refrain from any war or warlike actions between themselves. No slavery was to be tolerated. At the same time the various tribes agreed upon the delineation of their respective tribal territories, which in fact meant that the unoccupied areas between the tribes were left open for European occupation, and also became effective buffer areas between the scattered tribal groups.

The Barolong chief Matlabe at his request was settled at Maklaong, near Potchefstroom, after the Matabele had been driven out of the Transvaal, and he consequently was able to return to his old homeland. Similarly the Batlhaping under Gasibone, Sechele and Gotsisibie returned to their old haunts from Bechuanaland and were given land on which to settle. The Barolong under Montsioa settled along the banks of the Malopo River. The boundary areas of the Bantu tribes of the whole Western Transvaal up to Rustenburg were similarly agreed upon after consultation with each chief.

From the Western Transvaal (Potchefstroom-Rustenburg area) a number of Whites moved across the bare Highveld area which includes the present-day districts of Middelburg, Standerton, Ermelo, Bethal, Witbank, and others, into the Lowveld where the towns of Ohrigstad and Lydenburg were established around the 1850s. This whole area was bought from Umswazi, the chief of the Swazi, in July 1846. Previous to this agreement another agreement was made with Sekwati, chief of the Pedi people who lived in the mountainous country between the Olifants and Steelpoort Rivers in the Eastern Transvaal, according to which the boundaries of the chiefs' territories were decided upon by mutual agreement. A further treaty in 1855 with the Swazi and a treaty of 1864 with the Mapoch tribe rounded off the treaties with the tribes of the Eastern Transvaal according to which White and Black accepted the territorial boundaries acceded to by each group according to a mutually satisfactory agreement at the time of the signing of the treaty.

Similar agreements were entered into between the Whites of the Transvaal and the Zulus living on the South Eastern borders of the Transvaal in 1849, 1852 and 1864 respectively. After the Zulu wars of 1879 between the Zulus and the British, Zululand was in a perpetual state of unrest as a result of the assassination of the Zulu king Cetschwayo by the hand of one of the usurpers to the throne. Dinizulu, the rightful heir to the throne, thereupon called on individual Dutch farmers along the border to help him restore order. According to a proclamation issued by Dinizulu,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an area of land of approximately one million morgen* was handed over to these farmers along the border of the Transvaal in lieu of payment for services rendered. The farmers thereupon established a republic—The New Republic. The reaction of the British Government was to annex the whole of Zululand excluding the area of the New Republic which, following representations made to the Transvaal government, resulted in the incorporation of this territory in the Republic of the Transvaal.

Treaties similar to the above were entered into after 1846 between the Whites and the Bantu chiefs of the Northern Transvaal. The most important of these chiefs were Mogali (Pretoria-Rustenburg area), Makapaan (Potgietersrust), Moletsi, Zebediela, Magoeba and the well known yet legendary rain queen of Rider Haggard's *She* fame, and Modjadi in the Potgietersrust-Pietersburg area. Treaties were also made with the Venda under Makhado of the Zoutpansberg mountains and Malaboch of the Blouberg mountains in the Northern Transvaal.

According to these treaties the tribal areas thus delineated were regarded as reserves on which no Whites were allowed to encroach and where no Whites were allowed the right of land tenure. They also inferred the opposite, namely that the same rule would apply to any Bantu encroaching on the White areas.

In 1882, on the expressed wish of the British Government, a so-called "Location Commission" was appointed with the purpose of clearly establishing and surveying the boundaries between the Whites and the various Bantu tribes as reflected in the treaties and agreements made from time to time. The work of this commission continued until 1899 when it was interrupted by the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer war.

Natal

A group of the Trekkers which left the Cape Colony under Pieter Retief decided to move into Natal in order to be nearer a sea port. When the Trekkers arrived in Natal the Bantu tribe that ruled there was the Zulu under their chief Dingaan, who had his main kraal at Umgungundhlovu near the white Umfolozi River in Northern Natal. Already in June 1833 he had for various reasons recalled all his subjects from the territory south of the Tugela River from the Drakensberg mountains to the sea. As Moodie, in his *The History of Battles in South Africa,* published in 1888, puts it: ". . . and [these Zulus] have never since occupied any portion of the country to the southward of that river which is still considered as their boundary in that direction." It was this empty area that Pieter Retief and his Trekkers intended to occupy, and

*A morgen equals 2.11654 acres.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in November 1837 Dingaan intimated his willingness to grant them this territory under certain conditions. On the 4th of February 1838 Dingaan signed a treaty according to which the territory was given to the Trekkers as their "everlasting property," to quote from the document. On the 6th of February the unsuspecting Pieter Retief and a number of his followers who had come to the head kraal of Dingaan were suddenly set upon and murdered. The eventual result was the Battle of Blood River on the 16th of December 1838 followed by a few minor clashes which resulted in Dingaan fleeing towards Swaziland where he was murdered by Swazi soldiers.

Mpande, the half-brother of Dingaan, thereupon succeeded to the throne. He took it upon himself to see to it that the terms of the treaty of the 4th of February 1838 were adhered to. The war of 1879 between the Zulu and the British was not the result of the encroachment of the Whites on Zulu territory but resulted from diverse other causes into which we need not go here. Suffice it to say that the war resulted in the destruction of the Zulu power and the division of Zululand into a number of smaller chieftainships. Disputes between these chiefs and the resulting unrest led to the annexation of Zululand in 1888—and, although the Zulu of necessity did lose some territory in the process, the hard core of the Zulu homeland was retained.

Conclusion

Thus the by now well known chequered pattern of Bantu homelands and White areas came into existence in Southern Africa. In an all too brief account such as this, one is forced to give only the bare outlines of the background to the division of South Africa into White and Black areas. At the same time one must remember that after the establishment of the chequered pattern necessary adjustments had to be made. There was for instance the question of the interpretation of the exact boundary lines meant in the treaties and agreements, the interpretation of which resulted in misunderstanding and a resultant clash of interests. These questions were eventually settled, and according to Parliamentary Acts of 1913 and 1936 the Bantu areas were first of all proclaimed inviolable by the White man, and then extended by more than seven million morgen so that today the total area of the Bantu homelands covers approximately seventeen and a half million morgen.

It is against this background that the White man in the Republic of South Africa sees the problem of race relations, and it is in terms of this pattern that he is at the moment trying to find a solution to a problem that has become all the more pressing because of the world-wide attention riveted on the Republic. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faces the problem in the full knowledge that the conceived pattern is an accident of history but one from which he can not or dare not deviate. The stress on the belief in the priority of the White man's or the Black man's entry into South Africa, or the stress on the idea of simultaneous penetration, must be regarded as political apologists' formulas which are not sustained by historical fact.

For those who are interested and would like to do some further reading on the question of occupancy as set out above, I would like to refer to the following works:

Agar, Hamilton: *The Native Policy of the Voortrekkers, 1838-1858.*

Bryant, A. T.: *Olden Times in Zululand and Natal.*

Casalis, E.: *The Basutos.*

Harries, C. L.: *Laws and Customs of the Bapedi and Cognate Tribes.*

MacMillan, W. M.: *Bantu, Boer and Briton, the Making of the South African Native Problem.*

Marais, J. S.: *Maynier and the First Boer Republic.*

Midgley, J. E.: *The Orange River Sovereignty, 1848-1854.*

Schaepera, I.: *The Bantu Speaking Tribes of South Africa.*

Stow, G. W.: *The Native Races of South Africa.*

Sullivan, J. R.: *The Native Policy of Sir Theophilus Shepstone.*

Uys, C. J.: *In the Era of Shepstone.*

van Rooyen, T. S.: *Die verhouding tussen die Boere, Engelse en Naturelle in die Geskiednis van die Oos-Transvaal tot 1882* (''The Relations between the Boers, British and Natives in the History of the Eastern Transvaal up to 1882'').

The above are only a few of the hundreds of books written by travellers, missionaries, anthropologists, historians and other research workers that touch on the theme and from which the relevant facts have been gleaned. The original treaties and other factual material referred to in this all too cursory survey have been deposited in the archives of the Republic of South Africa situated in Cape Town, Pietermaritzburg (Natal), Bloemfontein (Orange Free State) and Pretoria (Transvaal) respectively.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THESE ARE THE GUILTY

Although the demand on our limited space is such that we are not able to provide a correspondence column or other means of enabling writers to answer each other in our pages, we have not hitherto made this specifically clear to our readers. When we were asked to publish the following three papers we felt, therefore, that we ought to make an exception to our usual practice. We feel sure that our contributors will appreciate our dilemma on this occasion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THESE ARE THE GUILTY *

By CARLETON PUTNAM

Let me begin by acknowledging a debt—a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Clifford Newell and Mark German for arranging this impressive meeting tonight. An attendance of over 600 is more than any of us expected, especially in the face of an ice storm in Maryland and Virginia. I am proud and grateful to your committee for inviting me to speak here, and I am proud and grateful to *you* for coming.

It is true that about two years ago I wrote a short book—hardly more than a monograph—called *Race and Reason* which has caused some controversy. A few attacks have even been made on it. Therefore, every now and then, friends of mine, here and there, have been good enough to give me a platform—like this one tonight—from which to answer those attacks.

So far it has not been an overwhelming task. I will not say that I expected a somewhat higher caliber of opposition, for that might be discourteous to our opponents. But there are only a few loose ends to clean up this evening, and then, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to launch an attack of my own. If I were a lay preacher I would take as my text the sixteenth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark those who cause divisions and offenses in opposition to the doctrine which you have learned. . . . For such persons . . . by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

I propose to suggest to you tonight, in this world of rising racial tensions, just who they are who have caused divisions and—however sincere their motives and beliefs—have deceived the hearts of the simple. And in view of the fact that the last time I made a speech one of the press services complained because I referred to a certain individual "whom I did not name," tonight I intend to name names—not all, indeed, because large organizations are involved—but enough to satisfy the press. And I intend to say to you, and to them: these are the guilty. . . .

* * *

I shall not go over again here what the evidence clearly shows regarding Jefferson's meaning—both as to the word "men" and as to the word "equal" in the phrase "all men are created equal"—nor need I repeat Hamilton's recognition that liberty and equality

* Address to the Washington Putnam Letters Club, 12th February 1963.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are mutually exclusive. It is obvious the founding fathers had no illusions about the equality of men in any sense except in equal rights to justice, and the Negro was not included even in that. But in America as the years went on, helped by the controversial Franz Boas, the notion of a Utopian social, economic and even biological equality persisted as a sort of demagogic fetish until things reached the point where the Swedish socialist Myrdal actually dared to write in his *American Dilemma* that in the conflict between liberty and equality in the United States "equality is slowly winning," and Handlin, the Harvard professor, could bring himself to declare: "There is no evidence of any inborn differences of temperament, personality, character, or intelligence among races."

This last remark lands us finally in the middle of our subject with a splash. For the benefit of the press I give the full name, Oscar Handlin, Professor of History at Harvard University, and while again I do not impugn his motives or sincerity, I assert that in my opinion Handlin's declaration is one of the most groundless and dangerously misleading statements to be found in print today.

Let us quickly review the evidence. All that we need is contained in that short, concise little book, *The Biology of the Race Problem,* which I shall cite hereafter simply as the George Report. In spite of the example of the equalitarians, a thousand pages are not required to come to the point on this subject.

If you will consult Section IV of the George Report you will note the findings of Bean, Connolly and Vint on the differences in frequencies of occurrence of certain features of White and Negro brains. The importance of these differences is plainly set out in quotations and citations from and to Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I repeat: you will find it all in the space of ten pages in Section IV. If you want more data, I can refer you to the leading article in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. 2, No. 4, which amplifies and still further documents Dr George's material. The differences in question are physical and hereditary. That they account for differences in temperament, behavior and intelligence between the two races is beyond doubt. That these differences make the amalgamation of the races undesirable is just as clear. All the other sections of the George Report confirm these facts.

There is not time enough tonight to discuss the full report. But I will call your attention to something on which Dr George does not touch: in 1940 the illegitimacy rate for Negroes throughout the United States was eight and a half times the rate for Whites. Nineteen years later, nineteen years in which Americans have struggled hard to raise Negro standards, the rate is ten times that for Whites. In other words, as their environment has been improved, their performance has gone down. Taking the single state of Virginia in the twenty years between 1938 and 1958, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

White illegitimacy rate declined slightly from 2.6 to 2.3 per cent. In this same period which witnessed astonishing gains in Negro education, Negro housing, Negro income and Negro job opportunities, the rate of Negro illegitimacy increased from 19.5 to 22.9 per cent. This is difficult to explain if the Negro's limitations are due solely to his environment.

Speaking of explanations, it is going to be still more difficult for the professors to evade Bean, Connolly and Vint. They have already begun to say: "Oh, but the samplings are not adequate." [These samplings varied from 30 brains in some cases to 165 in others]. Well, I have a question to ask these professors and all who criticize the George Report on this most vital point. If you do not like the samplings of Bean, Connolly and Vint, why have you never produced anything better? You have most of the money, you have the captive foundations—they have hundreds of millions —and there are plenty of other sources anxious to help you. Yet to the best of my knowledge you have not even *tried* to assemble any contrary evidence. Do not tell us that you cannot be bothered or that this is not important. This is the most important point in the whole controversy. Either the Negro's limitations are innate or they are not, and this evidence settles the matter. So I ask again, why have you never even tried to produce any other samplings?

The answer is simple. You have not tried because you do not dare. You know well enough what the results would be, provided you had an objective study and included a Dr George or two on the panel. I suggest that you now make such a study—a series of any size you like of average West African Negro brains, because there you get the least diluted essence of the Negro, against a series of average White brains—the study to be jointly run by scientists on both sides of the question. Meanwhile we have Bean, Connolly and Vint, Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I dislike being rude to amiable Harvard professors but I must say to Oscar Handlin (and I am going to say it to several others this evening): the time has come to put up or shut up. Either answer Bean, Connolly and Vint or explain to the public why you cannot.

While I am on the subject of the George Report I have another suggestion to offer. The press quotes George F. Carter, a professor of geography at Johns Hopkins University, as having said about this report: "The arguments they put up in that booklet are Swiss cheese—full of holes." It so happens that early last fall a mutual acquaintance communicated to me Carter's complaints about the George Report—this acquaintance listed fifty of them, acting as a sort of agent for Carter. I considered these fifty points carefully, and then I submitted them to Dr George. Thereafter they were submitted to scholars in New York. All

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this occurred before the Putnam Committee undertook the distribution of the report, and it was unanimously decided that, apart from three or four points about which some shadow of argument might be made but which did not bear on any essentials, the fifty points were without any substance whatsoever.

There was one item which Carter considered to be a quotation out of context and which we corrected with an erratum sheet. Jerry Doolittle of the Washington *Post* made much out of this correction in the *Post* for 9th December. So I have a question to ask Doolittle: assuming Carter is right in his statement that differing climates had identical effects in the way they "sharpened the wits" of all mankind, can either you or Carter honestly believe that the climate of the tropics and the climate of northern Europe over tens of thousands of years had identical effects on the development of those special qualities of the civilized forebrain, namely, foresight and long-range planning? Carter's dwelling on one aspect of molding does not exclude the existence of other aspects. If Doolittle thinks it does, he had better consult someone else besides a geographer. He will find experts on *that* subject in other sections of the George Report.

But let me come to Carter's fifty points and give you two examples: on page 27 of his report, Dr George cites the work of Bean which was published in 1906. On this Carter remarks: "Reference from Bean is nearly sixty years old. Haven't there been any developments or thoughts in this long period?" If Carter had read the Report with any attention he would have found that Connolly's work was published in 1950 and Penfield's in 1957.[1] This brings Bean right up to date. But are we in some sort of competition here on dates? Does its date make Newton's law of gravitation invalid?

Secondly, on page 68 Dr George writes: "If there were more Negroes with talents for civilization, we would have no race problem or it would be a very different one." To which Carter remarks: "Again nonsense. Boston had a race problem with the Irish. Many people have a Jewish race problem even though these races have talents for civilization." Well, ladies and gentlemen, is not this what Dr George has already just said? He has just said, "or it would be a very different one." And that is precisely what the Irish and Jewish problems were, "very different ones."

I leave you to judge where the nonsense lies in these two examples, and I invite Carter to publish in the newspapers all of his fifty criticisms of the George Report, just as he has seen fit to publish his Swiss cheese. I have a science degree but I am not a professional scientist and I do not debate with professional scientists. However, I dare say scientists can be found who will

[1] First published in 1950.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer Carter—also in the press. I simply suggest to Carter that he prepare better criticisms than the ones our mutual acquaintance submitted to me, unless he wants to lose the game by a score of fifty to nothing. And I warn him that before he can walk with Alice in the Wonderland of unbridled environmentalism he must first get by the narrow gate of Bean, Connolly, Vint and Penfield. I could have sat next to Caruso for dinner every night for a lifetime and never sung as Caruso sang. No amount of cultural contact, no amount of integration would have made the slightest difference, except that if I had tried to sing with Caruso I would have spoiled the opera. And what is true of the vocal chords is true of the frontal lobes.

Out at the University of Chicago there is another professor who thinks he can brush Dr George aside. For the benefit of the press, let me name him, Manning Nash, Associate Professor of Anthropology. Nash had begun by attacking *Race and Reason* in a long article in *Current Anthropology* last June which was answered by me in a few short sentences on Bean, Connolly and Vint which I put in a letter I sent to Sol Tax, editor of the magazine. Thereupon Nash wrote me saying he doubted if my letter would ever be published so he was going to answer me right off privately. He proceeded to ignore all the substantive issues by calling Dr George, who is considerably above him in academic status, "unscientific," and then he urged me to read the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation so that I might learn something about the legal equality of all human beings.

To Nash I answered: "Regarding your paragraph on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, you appear never really to have read *Race and Reason,* or much American history. Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, refutes you on page 62, lines 4-8, of *Race and Reason*; Lincoln refutes you on pages 8-9. It so happens that Lincoln was a lawyer and you are not. Until the aberration of the 1954 Supreme Court decision no competent lawyer supposed that there was any 'legal' right on the part of the federal government to force Negroes into White schools. And that Court reached its decision on sociological and pseudo-scientific rather than legal grounds."

But to get back to the George Report, when this report was first issued there appeared in many newspapers throughout the South, by some sore of spontaneous combustion, an answer from a man named Charles C. Perkins, Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Emory University in Atlanta. Perkins was very patronizing, very sure that no even moderately reputable psychologist would come up with findings such as the report contained, quite forgetting Dr Garrett, for fifteen years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia and a past president of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Psychological Association. Perkins then went on to remark that while there "just aren't many facts that allow positive conclusions" and while he did not want even his rebuttal evidence to be taken too seriously, nevertheless "Alpha examinations given World War I soldiers indicated the average northern Negro was smarter than the average southern White man."

It is difficult to understand Perkins' willingness to use this material even with apologies. This is the well known and long discredited Klineberg Twist, and for the benefit of the press I am referring to Otto Klineberg, Professor of Psychology at Columbia University. What Klineberg did in this case was to take the four Southern states where the White averages were *lowest* and compare them with the four Northern states where the Negro averages were *highest.* If we take the Whites in the same Northern states as the Negroes, these Whites scored far above the Negroes. It is an old equalitarian trick to compare the best of one group with the worst of another and, of course, such a procedure has no validity whatever. If you take an above-average Negro and give him a lot of advantages he will do better than a below-average White man who has had very few. Wherever you have overlapping statistical distributions, the top of one will always exceed the bottom of the other. This is not the problem under discussion. The thing we are interested in is what the average Negro will do when compared with the average White man under like conditions. Anyone interested in the latter question will find decisive answers in the George Report. This is the only issue, and it is the issue Perkins is clouding and confusing. I urge you in dealing with these people to keep them to the point. Their specialty is irrelevance.

I might say that I think the championship in this respect goes this year to a man up at the University of Connecticut. I refer to one Donald C. Simmons who is listed as a member of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. It would hardly seem proper to take your time with this 36-year-old assistant professor were it not for the fact that *The New Republic* magazine has seen fit on two separate occasions to publish his attacks which now include both *Race and Reason* and the George Report.

My first brush with Simmons occurred last summer when *The New Republic* printed a review by him of *Race and Reason* in which he accused me of quoting scientists out of context. When I asked him for one example, he was able to give none. Perhaps he was basing his criticism on hearsay from an article by Howard Margolis of *Science* magazine. Margolis made the same accusation, and when asked to provide an example gave my quotation from Kluckhohn on page 51 of *Race and Reason.* I answered this accusation in a letter which *Science* published. I also answered it in a speech in New Orleans a year ago. I have heard nothing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Margolis since. And I doubt if I will hear any more on this subject from Simmons either.

Simmons' most recent effort appeared in *The New Republic* for 5th January and is of a somewhat more specific nature. He begins by referring to the George Report and the measurement of intelligence by brain size. Simmons mentions a group of male Negro brains which he says were found to weigh more than a certain group of female White brains. You will remember that on page 61 of the George Report there is a footnote which reads in part as follows: "The essential point here is that, *other things being equal,* [such as sulcification and microscopic structure of the cortex] and considering higher animals in general prespective the larger the brain relative to body size, the greater the intelligence." Note the phrase "relative to body size." Among other factors, the average body size of women is notably smaller than that of men. Thus their brain size would be expected to be smaller without lessening of intelligence. Apparently we have another case here of a man who has not read with any attention what he is attacking.

Next Simmons dances the Klineberg Twist, about which no more need be said, and then he gives us a quotation from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues which reads as follows: ". . . the more comparable the background of White and Negro groups, the less the difference in intelligence." However, if you will turn to the *American Psychologist* magazine for May of 1962 you will find that Dr Garrett answered that statement by showing that there have been six studies on the subject and *all* of them contradict the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Our Connecticut friend then moves on to comment about some experiments in Baltimore purporting to show that no difference can be found between White and Negro infants up to 40 weeks, and that differences thereafter must be due to socio-economic factors. But the lower centers of the brain and nervous system, in human beings and in animals, are the ones which mature first; the higher centers mature last. Therefore similarity of performance in the early stages of life signifies nothing as to adult potentiality.

Finally Simmons remarks on what he calls the racist accusation that the Negro never invented an alphabet and points out that many other races did not either. But if he will read the *Biology of the Race Problem* he will see that George makes no such accusation. George says that the Negro never invented *a system of writing.* It is true that alphabets are rare. Systems of writing are not. The Negro never invented either. I shall not weary you further with Simmons. My only comment must be one of surprise at the acceptance of this sort of material for the second time by *The New Republic.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Well, we have had a look at Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Emory and the University of Connecticut. Let us return to Harvard for a moment, the university where the FBI had to arrest Zaborowski, a research associate in the Department of Anthropology. I do not mention this in any criticism of the department at Harvard. It might have happened anywhere. I cite it as an example of how important the communists consider it to be to corrupt the minds of our young people in this field.

The New York *Times* on 9th December 1962 ran a review of Dr Carleton Coon's book, *The Origin of Races.* This review was written by Professor William H. Howells, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Harvard. Up until the last two paragraphs Howells sticks to his subject and I have no comments to make. However, in the last two paragraphs he launches a thinly veiled attack upon my pamphlet, *Evolution and Race: New Evidence.* He opens the first of these paragraphs with the remark that certain parts of Coon's book have been "pounced on with delight by the present cohort of racists." This opening gambit is the usual introduction used by these people in order to arouse anger rather than reason in their readers. If a man acknowledges the facts of race, he is a racist. I suppose if he acknowledges the facts of sex he is a sexist.

But I move on. Howells next says that, *even if Coon is correct,* it is not possible to use his hypothesis to measure modern racial differences. Let us think about that for a moment. If Coon is correct, the Caucasian race passed the threshold of evolutionary development in brain structure from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* 200,000 years ahead of the Negro. This matter of brain structure is biological, inherent, hereditary. Evolution is a continuing process. If one race has a head start of 200,000 years over another, does Howells mean to suggest that this head start has no significance—does he see no possible relation between it and the differences found by Bean, Connolly and Vint in White and Negro brains, or the results of intelligence tests, or the figures on crime and illegitimacy, or the level of civilization in Haiti, or the stability of governments in the Congo? Nobody is trying to take a pair of calipers and declare what is the exact measure of difference in the two races today. But I will tell Howells it makes *enough* difference to the Southern mother when she puts her girls in school.

This amiable Harvard professor, furthermore, is not above playing a guessing game in these final paragraphs. At one place he refers to a passage from page ix of the introduction to Coon's book which reads as follows: "It is a fair inference . . . that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of *Homo Sapiens* the earliest have evolved the most and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the *sapiens* state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena." On this passage Howells makes the comment in parenthesis: "Those who are so tickled with page ix of the introduction might try continuing to page 661."

Of course the average reader of Howells' review will not have at hand a copy of *The Origin of Races* and hence will not be able to evaluate the parenthesis because he will have no access to page 661. Does Howells intend to leave the implication of some contradiction? Page 661 deals both with selection and with the tendency to eventual resegregation of genetic characters in racial interbreeding. I wonder if Howells supposes this to be compensation to Southern society which, after many generations of chaos, might look forward to such an eventuality. Thereafter the chaos would start all over again.

And while we are jumping about from page to page I might call Howells' attention to page 336. I shall not keep you in the dark about what is on that page. Here Coon refers to "the great variability of twentieth century human beings, *in evolutionary grades* [emphasis mine] as well as in racial lines." Coon calls these differences important. He also says that, from the perspective of life as a whole, they are slight. Obviously if you run the gamut from the amoeba to man they *are* slight. But what a whale of a difference a few brain cells make! You can find *that* discussed in the George Report at page 34.

Finally our amiable Harvard professor sums up his view of my pamphlet in this extraordinarily penetrating remark: "Anyhow I see no way of using such arguments [the 200,000 year evolutionary lag] to disprove the Constitution of the United States." Would anyone in the audience care to tell me where the Constitution mentions the integration of schools? If we look at the Fourteenth Amendment, do we see any reference to schools? Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to share with you a not very well kept secret. The people who put the integration of schools into the Constitution were Howells and his kind, the equalitarian anthropologists and sociologists who misled the Supreme Court and the American people with their mess of half-truths and slanted evidence.

I say now to Howells and all his crowd: you have not only misled the Supreme Court and the American people, you have fooled the Negro about himself. You have poisoned his mind with expectations that cannot be realized and inflamed him with an arrogance that has no justification. You have set him against the White man. You have made him think he has a grudge against the White race when the truth is he owes the White race a greater debt that he can ever repay. Offer a few Negroes one-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way tickets to Africa, where they can enjoy the culture of their own race, and see how many takers you get.

I tell you without fear of contradiction that the American people are as kindly a people as any in the world, that nowhere else in the world would Negroes in such numbers have found a better haven. Yet James Baldwin and these much publicized "angry black men" writing books and long articles for the *New Yorker* magazine damn the White American. Baldwin writes pityingly about his ancestor who was dragged to America in chains. But I say to Baldwin that if his ancestor had not been brought here in chains, he would have died a far more terrible death as a slave in Africa. Baldwin is lucky to be here.

And I say to Leopold Stokowski that I revere him as a musician but when he appears on David Susskind's "Open End" TV program and declares that the White man owes the Negro an apology he is guilty of a groundless and inflammatory statement on a subject about which he is incorrectly informed. He is encouraging the Negro to violence and revenge against a race to which the Negro owes an infinite debt.

In this matter Susskind and Stokowski and other public figures across the nation run blindly with the pack. Yet standing here tonight it is not primarily these that I indict, nor *The New Republic* nor even the Supreme Court. Least of all is it the average Negro. I indict the men who have fooled and goaded the Negro—the men who have made it necessary for the rest of us to point out truths which the Negro might otherwise have been spared the telling. I indict the Howellses, the Nashes, the Perkins, the Carters, the Klinebergs, the Handlins, the Herskovitses, the Simmonses, and the Sol Taxes who have spawned our racial tension here and abroad.

And I indict their associations. These men indeed run in packs. They have provided the basis for this whole house of cards that is starting to fall around their heads. If White settlers are being dispossessed and murdered in Kenya, if nuns are being raped in the Congo, if White men and girls are being slugged on the streets of our Northern cities, if the Supreme Court has to warn its employees about going home at night, look to the source. "Mark those who cause divisions and offences . . . and deceive the hearts of the simple."

Here I would like to incorporate by reference what I said a year ago in New Orleans (in "The Road to Reversal") about my exchange of correspondence with the president of the American Anthropological Association, Sherwood Washburn. Then I would like to ask: have I now given you enough cases to demonstrate the utter lack of facts on the equalitarian side of this controversy and the poverty of their arguments? Out of all these universities and the resolutions of these associations not one iota of evidence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or one shred of argument has come that cannot be exploded in thirty seconds. It is all as stale and empty as the notion that the sun revolves around the earth.

Have I also provided enough illustrations of the way these scientists operate? Because, if not, I could go on. I could mention the fact that on one occasion when a certain scientific association was about to pass a resolution condemning *Race and Reason* there was a pause in the proceedings. And someone asked for a show of hands on how many had read the book. In a room full of people how many do you suppose had read it? Three. And yet they were about to pass, and did pass, a resolution damning something they had never read. Does that episode need any further comment from me?

Listen to what the man who was for fifteen years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University (he was a member of the faculty for thirty years) has to say about these political resolutions by scientists. I quote you Henry Garrett in a letter to me last October:

> I knew Franz Boas personally. I was able to observe the influence of Boas as founder of the science of anthropology in America and to evaluate the extent to which Boas' socialistic ideology dominated his thinking and permeated the teaching of his disciples, first at Columbia and later at other universities fed from the Boas cult. I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by this cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality dogma was maintained.
>
> I will go so far as to assert that the supporters of the equality dogma in science in America today fall into three classes—those who are intimidated, those who are driven by left-wing political motives and those who are honest but mistaken humanitarians. I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression which has fallen upon the academic world in the area of which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain other related sciences. In the light of this situation the resolutions are not surprising.

Dr Robert Gayre has told me that not since the days of Galileo has science seen anything like it. When Simmons reviewed *Race and Reason,* he asked if I were looking for an "apostate" anthropologist. You know what that word means. An apostate is one who departs from a dogma. Here, in other words, is one of the younger generation who does not even realize his self-betrayal—who has never learned that science is a matter of research and facts, not dogma.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the face of this grotesque state of affairs I would like to ask the Kennedy brothers a question. Next to population control, the race problem is undoubtedly the most urgent in the world today; it is basic to everything else, even to the cold war. Do you, or do you not, consider it desirable that you inform yourselves on both sides of this matter? All your lives you have been listening to political propaganda masquerading under the name of science. It would take you less than an hour to read Section IV of the George Report and the article in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, less than an hour to talk to Dr George or Dr Garrett. Have you done either?

The decision of the Supreme Court does not relieve you from studying the subject. You have seen what that decision has done to the nation. You are not President and Attorney General solely for the Negro population or the Northern or Western radicals. You also happen to be serving millions of people who believe the decision was viciously wrong and who know more about the matter first-hand than you will ever know. Why have you never given a hearing to the scientists on their side? Are you afraid of losing some votes? Are you afraid of the Catholic Church? I have been told that this is the case, but I refuse to believe it. Any man who buys a vote by doing the wrong thing, or the ignorant thing, in a job like yours is on the skids of history, and you are smart enough to know it. And as for the Supreme Court, it would switch fast enough if you discovered the truth and went out and told it on the mountain. The American majority would respond with a roar and these minority-group arguments would vanish like last year's snow.

Stop and think for a minute. You have the record of the centuries and of today in Africa, you have the facts in certain countries of South America and you have them in Haiti. In the United States you have crime records and you have illegitimacy records. You also have forty years of intelligence tests. All these point in one direction, namely, that the Negro has created his history and environment (not vice versa) and will create it again wherever he is allowed to. Next you have the microscopic studies of Vint, the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Halstead and Penfield, and the recent evidence presented by Dr Coon, president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. You have pages of other evidence in the George Report. Finally you know the background of the equalitarian school, you know who started it and the political and social views of most of its leaders. All of *this* points in one direction.

For each of the above items some far-fetched excuse might be conceived. Any one of them might possibly be debated. But consider them all together.

Let me suggest a parallel. You are walking along a hotel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

corridor and as you pass a bedroom door you hear loud, angry voices. Then you hear one of the voices say, "Take that, you dirty dog!" and you hear two shots and the sound of a body falling. So you open the door and you find one man standing with a smoking gun in his hand, looking down at another man with two bullets in his heart.

After some personal risk and minor injuries you manage to capture the man with the gun and, at the trial, the following facts develop. The dead man was shortly to have married his childhood sweetheart and was said by several witnesses to have been joyful over this, having courted her long and earnestly. Further, it appears that the dead man, the week before, had inherited a million dollars, after taxes, from an uncle he had never seen. The accused, on the other hand, according to reliable testimony, had coveted the dead man's sweetheart and had been repulsed by her. In fact, he had several times sworn he would kill the deceased. The gun is found to have been the property of the accused.

The defense pleads that the death is a suicide. The point is made that the dead man might just conceivably have changed his mind about his fiancée and have become depressed at the thought of marriage. As for the million dollars, after taxes, this might not have been enough to compensate for the death of the uncle he had never seen. Regarding the remark, "Take that, you dirty dog!"—this may have been the deceased talking to himself. Upon your telling the court that you knew the voice of the dead man with whom you had been associated for many years and that the voice was not his, the defense replies that the deceased was only 30 years old and his voice may have been changing.

Concerning the gun, which turns out to be a Smith and Wesson, the defense proposes that this might just possibly have been stolen by the deceased from the accused because, although the deceased had a Colt of his own in the bottom of his suitcase, he preferred suicide with a Smith and Wesson. Finally, in regard to the threats of the accused, these might by a remote chance have been unrelated to the shooting and due instead to cultural deprivation on the part of the accused.

On the basis of this evidence, the Court takes the case away from the jury and directs a verdict in favor of the accused. Although the accused has threatened to kill two other men in the community, his gun is returned to him and he is complimented and set free. The newspapers are loud in their praise of this verdict. A few weeks later you read in one of them that the other men who were threatened have indeed died under mysterious circumstances thought by the staff writer for this paper to be suicide. On the following Sunday you turn on your TV and you see and hear certain prominent men apologize to the accused for the inconvenience the community has caused him. In the press

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that same Sunday appear editorials bitterly attacking the prosecuting attorney in the case. Clearly the whole tragedy, according to these papers, was a matter of cultural deprivation on the part of the dead man. As a matter of fact, you read in the news section that the prosecuting attorney has lost his job and is on relief.

At this point you might be forgiven if you put down your paper with a sigh, particularly after hearing on the radio that counsel for the defense was a fraternity brother of the judge.

A man with a weak, confused mind might perhaps be persuaded that some one or two of the following things were true, namely, that the deceased was depressed at the thought of marrying his childhood sweetheart, *or* that he could not bear the loss of the uncle he had never seen in spite of the million dollars after taxes, *or* that he preferred to steal a Smith and Wesson rather than kill himself with his own Colt, *or* that his voice was changing at the age of 30, *or* that the threats against him were due solely to cultural deprivation—but a man who could believe all these things ought to be in a mental institution.

By the same token, anybody who can believe that the Negro's limitations are solely environmental in the face of African history, *and* of Haitian history, *and* of U.S. crime records, *and* of U.S. illegitimacy records, *and* of forty years of intelligence tests, *and* of the microscopic studies of Vint, *and* of the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Penfield and Halstead, *and* of the latest synthesis of Carletoon Coon, *and* of the other evidence in the George Report, *and* of the unmasking of the infiltration of the life sciences by political dogma—any person, I say, who can believe the Negro is the product of his history and environment (instead of vice versa) in the face of all those facts may not belong in a mental institution, but I dread the thought of his teaching any child of mine.

I must warn you that on the equalitarian side of this controversy there is great cleverness and great evasiveness. Do not let yourself be distracted from the point. There is just one issue, and I will put it in this way: in one group you have masses of brains which, *on the average,* are at a certain evolutionary level. In a separate group you have other masses of brains which, *on the average,* are at a different evolutionary level. Is it wise to adopt public policies which will encourage the biological mixing of those two groups of brains?

You must not be confused by the mulatto red herring, or the overlap red herring, or the religious red herring, or the legal red herring or the civil rights red herring, or the red herring of American democracy. These matters are all of the greatest importance but they have nothing to do with the fundamental issue. If the mixing is wrong, then public policies leading toward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it cannot be Christian, they cannot be American, they cannot be civil rights—and they ought not to be legal.

Cleaning up the situation is going to require inspection of the evidence by intelligent public leaders, it is going to require listening to both sides and studying both sides. It is going to require going down to the end of the road on each item—statement and answer, rejoinder and surrejoinder, rebuttal and surrebuttal, until neither side has anything left to say. But I assure the President and the Attorney General: if you will investigate this matter and hear both sides impartially and to a conclusion, there is no doubt what that conclusion will be. You ought to have done it long ago. Eisenhower ought to have done it in 1954.

With particular reference to the Supreme Court, do you realize that most of the material we have been discussing tonight never was put before it? The whole record in the school cases is a scientific travesty. What is needed now—and has been needed since 1954—is executive leadership in channeling a new case based on new evidence up to the Court. I suggest to the President and the Attorney General that, having satisfied themselves as to the facts, they throw their weight behind getting a new case heard, instead of blindly talking about their duty to enforce a judicial decision which is a nightmare scientifically, legally and morally.

Let me add one last remark about my hotel drama. Any similarity between that episode and the groups in our racial controversy is purely a coincidence. Actually and in all seriousness I intend no parallel whatever between the Negro and the accused. I leave you to judge how I feel about counsel for the defense and the other characters in the story.

The time has come for me to draw these comments to a close. Today we have celebrated the birthday of a great man. He was not only an American hero. He was beloved throughout the world. He was a devout Christian, a man of wide compassion and sensitive tenderness. We know what he thought and said about the Negro and I shall not quote him on that subject again. We know that in 1858 he made it clear that he did not favor in any way the social or political equality of the White and Black races. We also know that in 1864, when his days were nearly done, he wrote a letter to the governor of Louisiana "barely suggesting" his hope that some "very intelligent" Negroes might be admitted to the franchise—of course under the control, and at the discretion, of the states. Surely with this we may agree.

However, I think we may be equally sure that Lincoln would have had nothing but contempt for these latter-day reconstructionists sitting here in Washington and elsewhere who at bayonet point would force the Negro into schools and other social situations with White children against the wishes of their parents. He would have had nothing but contempt for a welfare agency which farms

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out helpless White orphans to a Negro foster home. He would not have blamed the Negro for this. If ever there was a leader who would have cleansed the temple with a lash on the backs of the real culprits, Lincoln was the man.

But Lincoln was kind. I think he would have liked Dr Garrett's way of expressing the difference between the White and Negro races. Dr Garrett prefers to speak less of inferiority than of racial immaturity, and I have changed this slightly so that I speak now of racial youth. Indeed I have tried to make it clear wherever I have used the word inferiority that I am referring solely to limitations in adaptability to our specific Western culture. But watch the scientists and the equalitarian press—they will always drag out the phrase "Negro inferiority charged" and put it in headlines when they attack us. Like the word racist, it is a badge of their demagoguery.

Lincoln was kind, too, in his attitude toward the South. Had he lived he would have bound up the South's wounds as well as the North's. There would have been no Reconstruction Period. And although the Fourteenth Amendment was passed after Lincoln's death, I will go so far as to say that if he could see the manner in which that Amendment is being abused today, and hurled against the South, he would turn in his grave.

So tonight I am not going to end this talk with a quotation from Lincoln about the Negro. I am going to end it with a different quotation from Lincoln which I recommend to the meditations of the two anthropological associations, and of the Supreme Court and of John F. Kennedy and of Dwight Eisenhower: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I might add that you cannot fool nature any of the time. Genetic racial differences in intelligence, character and behavior are the basic reality of life. As Dr Coon has said, there is great variability in the evolutionary status of human populations all over the earth. This is the fundamental fact in the world today. National or international policy built on any other foundation is a house built on sand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comments on the Teachings of Carleton Putnam

By DWIGHT J. INGLE

The struggle for special rights and privileges of individuals and groups throughout the world is opposed more strongly than ever before by faith in man's worth as an individual, free to pursue his self-fulfillment and happiness as indispensable goals of life. The civil rights of the individual are guaranteed by constitutional law in many countries of the world. This philosophy is soundly rooted in religion, ethics and jurisprudence. Equality of man is a social and ethical concept rather than biological;[1] the concept goes awry when it is extended to biology, for among things that live nothing is equal or identical to anything else.

This discussion concerns a specific question: are there significant average differences in the genetic component of intelligence and other qualities of intellect of Negroes and Whites? I am of the opinion that the question is unsettled, that it is important, and that progress toward a solution of sociological problems could be hastened by fuller information about genetic differences of races. I use the word "race" in its ordinary sense, recognizing its limitations.

Racists have drawn the firm conclusion that the Negro race is genetically inferior to other races in intelligence, while some equalitarians have drawn the firm conclusion that all races are equally endowed with intelligence. Both groups support their respective dogma by spurious argument, emotionalism, and intolerance, also known as bigotry.

The observations that Negroes have contributed less to civilization than several other races, are commonly inept at self-government, perform less well on the average in the classroom and on objective tests of intelligence and achievement, and are more often involved in criminal acts than Whites, are not debated except by some irrational equalitarians. These facts, and discrimination

[1] Equality of man is a concept which stems from the French and Russian revolutions. Equality before the law is well recognised as a juridical principle, and so is equality before the throne of God as a theological one. We are faced, today, with the demand for absolute equality of rights in all spheres of activity. But absolute equality denies other fundamental rights, such as those of free association, property, inheritance, and family —especially in its extension to tribe, people and nation.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against Negroes, constitute a problem that our society is trying to correct by measures that are less than adequate.

It is clearly established that there is extensive overlap in the intelligence of Whites and Negroes. The concept that White and Negro races are approximately equally endowed with intelligence remains a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty evidence. The concept that the average Negro is significantly less intelligent than the average White is also a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty but, in my opinion, somewhat stronger evidence.

What kind of evidence would be needed to settle the question? First, as a basis for evidence, we need valid, culture-free measures of intelligence; second, representative samples of White and Negro populations would have to be studied; third, we need replication of the studies by different designs and methods; fourth, statistical determination of the significance of differences in test performance is necessary; and finally, we require debate and criticism of methods and results with exclusion of other plausible hypotheses. There is no culture-free method of measuring ability to learn and manipulate abstract ideas, and proper sampling would be difficult. Given these limitations, scientists aim to compare representative samples of Whites and Negroes in which the culture—home, street, and school—and the relevant variables are the same. One basic problem is that intelligence, culture, and social-economic standing all correlate with each other; selection according to one factor insures that the sample is atypical in respect to the other two variables. It has not been possible to control or equate the culture factor in comparing the intelligence of Whites and Negroes. I emphasize culture in addition to social-economic standing for they are not identical, and the cultures of Negro and White are likely to remain significantly different even when economic standing is controlled. Recent reports on the mother-child relationship in primates (H. F. and M. Harlow 1962), and on the early handling of laboratory animals (Levine 1960), claim important enduring effects of early environment on the biology and behavior of the animal.[2]

If it were possible to prove that there are significant average differences between representative samples of White and Negro brains in respect of any physical measure which is significantly correlated with intelligence and behavior, this would be strong evidence for a biological basis for racial differences in intelligence and behavior. Carleton Putnam, a non-scientist, teaches that such

[2] This is contrary to what we know from numerous investigations, namely that animals behave according to their heredity, and they only adapt to an environment when they have a natural predilection for it. No amount of early training will make a terrier a sheep-dog, or a collie a retriever. How, in any case, can early handling affect the biology of an animal? By what mechanism is this achieved?—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidence exists, and that for this and other reasons Negroes should be denied equal civil rights. I shall review this "evidence" and show that it is without scientific value.

What is cited as physical evidence that the brain of the Negro is inferior to that of the White? Putnam has referred to Bean, Vint and Connolly as having described morphologic differences in the brains, especially the frontal lobes, of Negroes and Whites. The three authors' descriptions of differences did not agree, although each concluded that no morphologic feature was found to be exclusively characteristic of either the White or the Negro brain. There is no objective evidence that any of the average differences claimed to exist are marks of inferiority or correlate with intelligence and behavior. Putnam referred to Herrick, Halstead, and Penfield and Rasmussen on the importance of the frontal lobes. None of these authors has submitted any evidence on racial differences in the structure of the frontal lobes; nothing is said by Herrick, Halstead, or Penfield and Rasmussen which would support the conclusion that such differences, if real, are marks of inferiority.

How should the claim of genetic inferiority of the Negro brain be tested? It would be necessary to gather representative samples of brains from different races in which environment, including prenatal and postnatal nutrition, was equivalent. The factors of age and health would have to be controlled. The brains would have to be removed from skulls at the same time after death, fixed, processed and measured by identical methods, and then studied as "unknowns" by not one but several experts. If it were possible to establish significant average differences in brains among races, it would remain to be shown that any difference is a mark of inferiority, or that it is a physical measure of intellect or other quality of mind. Claims to knowledge must also withstand replication of the experiments supplying the evidence as well as debate and criticism of the design of the study, the technical details, and the interpretation of data. Such studies have not been made for the simple reason that they are not possible.[3]

It is of interest to review the material and methods of Bean, Vint and Connolly to see what kind of evidence convinced Putnam. All used cadaver material; the means by which human brains come into the hands of the anatomists are highly selective and are unlikely to represent any living healthy population. There was not a relevant variable controlled in any of the three studies.

[3] The fact is that, in all living creatures, there is a relationship between bulk and brain size. To be of any use such studies would have to take into consideration the stature and bulk of the individuals concerned, because there are very tall Negroids whose brains ought to be large as compared with those of shorter Caucasoids.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I quote the authors on the source of materials. The following statements are from Bean:

> Most of the brains studied are from the collection at the Anatomical Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University and were placed at my disposal by Dr Mall who has also controlled the measurements taken. Some of the specimens were obtained through the courtesy of Dr Page from the Baltimore City Alms House, and some from Dr W. G. MacCallum, of the Pathological Department of the University.
>
> Group 1 contains brains that were removed from the body after it had been injected in the usual way with carbolic acid, alcohol, and glycerine through the femoral artery under five pounds' pressure, and afterwards with shellac in the same way. The brains were then placed in 10% formalin, vertex down, no weight being taken at the time. Sixty-four brains were treated in this manner.
>
> Group 2 contains brains treated in the same way, except that they were weighed at the time of removal from the body, and placed, vertex up, in 10% formalin.
>
> Brains in Group 3 were weighed when removed from the body, which had not been injected, and placed, vertex up, in 10% formalin.
>
> In Group 4 the brains were weighed a few days after being removed from the body, which had no previous injection, the brains being placed in 10% formalin, vertex up, after removal.
>
> Brains in Group 5 were weighed at the time of removal from the body, which had been injected with carbolic acid in the usual way. These brains were suspended in a solution of 40% formalin and 6% sodium chloride, vertex up.
>
> In Group 6 the brains were treated in the same way as in Group 5, except that they were suspended in 10% formalin and sodium chloride. Thirty-eight brains were preserved in this manner.
>
> Group 7 contains brains that were obtained from frozen and sawed sections of cadavers previously injected with formalin.
>
> Group 8 contains brains of infants preserved *in situ* by immersion of the head in 10% formalin after opening the membranes so as to allow the fluid to permeate the cerebral structures.
>
> Group 9 contains brains of Germans from Professor Waldeyer's laboratory in Berlin. The brains were weighed at the time of removal from the body and had been preserved in alcohol several years.
>
> The lot of brains includes a larger number from high-class Negroes than from high-class Caucasians, and a larger number from low-class Caucasians than from low-class Negroes, this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being especially true in regard to the Negro males and the Caucasian females. This statement is based on the following facts:

1. There is a larger number of deaths resulting from acute illnesses and from accidents among the Negroes, giving a larger number of brains from normal individuals.

2. That a larger number of Negro bodies are regularly disposed of to anatomists indicates less respect for the dead among Negroes, and it follows that more of the better class of Negroes would be received, since the Whites greatly outnumber the Blacks in Baltimore.

3. It is well known that only the lowest classes of Whites are unclaimed, especially among the women, who are apt to be prostitutes, or depraved, or the like, while among Negroes it is known that even the better class neglect their dead unless provision has been made for their care after death.

4. It is a well attested fact that the Negroes are at present roaming over the country without fixed abode in greater numbers than the Whites and this might result in many stray unclaimed bodies of the better class of Negroes being turned over to the anatomists, and finally,

5. Many Mulattoes and mixed bloods are included among the Negroes.

So then the brain weights do not really represent the exact racial difference between the Negro and the Caucasian, but do perhaps show that the low-class Caucasian has a larger brain than a better class Negro. Many of the brains are from the senile, the demented, or those dying of wasting diseases, which would tend to make the average weight lower than among normal individuals. The total stature of the Caucasian exceeds that of the Negro, and the total body weight is slightly greater in the Caucasian, the stature and body weight being greater in the males than in the females. The majority of the Caucasian males and Negro females were between the ages of 30 and 50, the majority of the others under 55 or over 45.

It is significant that the number of days between death and removal of the brain in Bean's series varied from 0 to 20.

Mall reviewed the work of Bean and reached different conclusions:

While these various attempts, which we consider unsuccessful, have been made to show that there is an unlike distribution of the brain substance in women and in men, attempts have been made to show that in the brains of Negroes as well as in those of men of genius similar distinctions can be found. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general the differences in weight between each of these three classes of brains is fully 100 grams, and if it were shown that the proportion of their parts is different in each class it would be a discovery of great importance. The smaller frontal lobe in women and in Negroes, and the larger in men of genius would prove, it is believed, that this portion of the brain is the chief seat of a good mind. It appears, however, that no such unequal distribution of brain substance exists.

Furthermore, Bean believed that he had shown that the genu is relatively larger and the splenium is relatively smaller in the Negro, an assertion which is even more striking than Spitzka's. From this as well as from other data Bean deduced that the frontal lobe is smaller in Negro brains than in White. This is in apparent contradiction to the results he obtained by comparing the position of the central sulcus, which in 126 hemispheres holds about the same position in the two classes of brains. If anything, it lies more posterior in the female Negro (Table IVa, p. 381) which would indicate that her frontal lobe is relatively the largest of all.

All of Bean's measurements are made from a brain axis which passes in the sagittal plane between the two hemispheres immediately above the anterior commisure and just below the splenium. As a rule this line (the axis) passes parallel with the longest axis of the corpus callosum and just below it. From this line he erected two perpendiculars, one just in front of the genu and one just behind the splenium. The distance between the two perpendiculars was then divided into ten parts, the first three, including the genu, he calls the genu, the second three the body, the next two the isthmus, and the last two, including the large rounded splenium, the splenium. He then compared the area of the genu with that of the splenium, using the former as ordinates and the latter as abscissae in the construction of his Chart VII. It was found by this treatment that the Negro brains separated almost completely from the White brains, in Bean's Chart VII, and this line of separation I have inserted at the proper place in my chart, Fig. 1.

I have tabulated as Bean did the area of the genu with that of the splenium in 106 brains and do not find that the symbols for the brains of the two races separate. Most of the Negro brains in my chart are intermixed with the White brains above the line which separates them in Bean's chart. My measurements were all made by tracing the outline of the corpus callosum with the very accurate projecting apparatus made by Hermann of Zurich, while Bean's were made with a less precise instrument borrowed from the Smithsonian Institution. The areas of both Bean's and my own were made with a Conradi planimeter whose minimum registration is 10 sq. mm. and its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probable error was found to be 10 sq. mm. In order to exclude my own personal equation, which is an item of considerable importance in a study like this, all the tracings as well as the measurements of all of the areas were made without my knowing the race or sex of any of the individuals from which the brains were taken. The brains were identified from the laboratory records just before the results were tabulated.[4]

In order to determine the relative weight of the frontal lobe in White and Negro brains I made numerous tests in separating this lobe from the rest of the cerebrum to develop first an accurate method. It was found that it is quite easy to break the cerebrum after it has been hardened in formalin through the central sulcus along the motor tract down through the basal ganglia with considerable precision. The real test of the accuracy was made by comparing the results obtained on the right side with those on the left. If the half brains are of equal weight the frontal lobes should be also of equal weight if the method is a reliable one. It was found in over two-thirds of the brains that the two frontal lobes weighed practically alike, *i.e.*, within 5 grams of each other, a variation which could be accounted for by a slight difference in the amount of drainage and evaporation of water from the specimens. In the remaining one-third of the brains the difference between the two sides averaged 10 grams, which in rough equals the weight of half of the precentral gyrus. Expressed differently the probable observational error in the weight of the frontal lobe compared with the whole hemisphere is less than one per cent of its weight, so a deviation in the weight of the frontal lobe due to race or sex would have to be fully two per cent in order to be detected.

Another source of error might be due to the fact that only hardened brains were broken, or could be broken, with precision through the central sulcus. It is well known that formalin causes the brain to swell, and it has been shown by Hrdlicka that there is an unequal expansion of the brain, due to both its age and its size. So it is possible for the frontal lobe at first to expand more rapidly than the rest of the brain, and later to shrink more quickly. This, of course, would affect the percentage of the frontal lobe and is a source of error to be reckoned with. The presence of a second preservative like common salt, alum or carbolic acid, which was used in a number of my specimens, is also to be taken into account, for they influence very much the change of volume of the brain.

In order to rest this question I weighed the pieces of five

[4] As the brains were largely from high-class Negroes and from low-class Whites, we would not expect much difference between the two samples as the measure of overlap must be considerable.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brains a number of times during a period of nearly a year and found that there was much fluctuation in the brain weight, but the percentage value of the frontal lobe remained very constant, usually within one-half of one per cent.

I must therefore conclude that with the methods at our disposal it is impossible to detect a relative difference in the weight or size of the frontal lobe due to either race or sex, and that probably none exists.[5]

Vint did not study a "control" series of White brains but reviewed some published data on White brains:

This communication is a record of macroscopical and microscopical examinations of 100 brains of Kenya natives.

The indigenous population of the Colony is said to be a mixture of Negroid and Hamite stocks. Their physique is poor; that of the Kikuyu, from which tribe 48 per cent of the material was obtained, has been described by Orr and Gilks as follows:

"The physique of the typical male Kikuyu may be judged from recruiting statistics (Tate, 1917-18). Of the 16,754 men of one district of the Reserve who were called up during 1917 for enrolment in the Carrier Corps, 10,912 were immediately rejected on medical grounds. Following the march of one hundred miles to the depot at Nairobi, a further 17 per cent were rejected as physically unfit."

Whether or not this description still holds good for the average native nevertheless, diseases common to other climates are as prevalent amongst the native population as diseases peculiar to the tropics. The high incidence of spirochaetal diseases, yaws and syphilis, must be taken into consideration in any deductions drawn from the findings in this series of brains. Spirochaetal diseases are stated not to affect the central nervous system of Africans, but an investigation just carried out by Dr H. L. Gordon, and my own experience of post-mortem work, do not support this belief for Kenya.

The material used was obtained at autopsies carried out personally in the native hospitals of Nairobi, but does not include cases from the prisons or the Mental Hospital. Only brains that appeared to be normal were used, and were all from adult males. An adult male was regarded as being one

[5] This statement is not justified on Mall's own showing. If he could not distinguish Negro from White when the Negroes were superior Negroes and the Whites were inferior Whites, the inference is that inferior Negroes would have been markedly inferior. It should be noted that many of the white women were prostitutes. There is ample evidence that prostitutes tend to be slightly simple, or of low intelligence.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 18 years of age or more. The 100 cases investigated were as follows:

Kikuyu (Bantu)	48
Kavirondo (Bantu)	16
Jaluo (Nilotic)	15
Wakamba (Bantu)	11
Other tribes	10

These 100 brains represent the average native population, but do not include any of the so-called educated class. The educated native is generally the product of the mission schools, and in my experience he is rarely seen on the post-mortem table.

SUMMARY

1. The average weight of the brain of the Kenya native is 10.6 per cent or 152 gm less than the average weight given for the brain of the European.

2. No disproportion was found in the percentage weights of the fore-brain and the mid- and hind-brain in the native.

3. A lunate sulcus was present in 70 per cent of the brains examined, and there was a tendency to exposure of the insula.

4. The reduction in size of the native brain, as compared with the European, seems to be accounted for mainly by a failure in development in height.

The following are quotations from Connolly:

THE MATERIAL INVESTIGATED

The material of this study embraced 60 complete brains or 120 hemispheres of the collection in the U.S. National Museum, Division of Physical Anthropology. Of these, 30 brains of Whites (Germans) were obtained some decades ago from Berlin where they had been fixed *in situ*. An equal number of Negro brains used in this study were also fixed *in situ* for the greater part, and extracted by Doctor Hrdlicka. These, according to anthropological tests applied by Doctor Hrdlicka to the individuals, represent full-blood American Negroes. They are selected and do not include any mulatto or colored specimens such as are included in the preceding study of the brains of the newborn and of children. There is of course always the possibility that some trace of an early racial mixture may be present, but this can be said of any so-called pure race. The series contains two specimens of Zulu brains. The specimens examined are excellently preserved and retain their natural form.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. Comparing the two large groups of White and Negroes, while the variability is large and there is much overlapping, the mean values reveal significant differences. The dimensions correlate well with what we might expect from a knowledge of the cranium of the two races. The Negro brain is on the average relatively longer, narrower, and flatter than the brain of Whites.

8. The frontal region, as measured by the projectional distance to midpoint of central sulcus, is, relative to the total length of the brain, larger in male Whites than in Negroes, while the parietal is larger in Negroes than in Whites. In the small group of females the frontal region does not show this excess in Whites, though again the parietal is larger in Negroes.

From the fissuration of the frontal lobes alone there appears to be no specific character by which one could distinguish a Negro brain from a White. It is a matter of frequencies and these can usually be correlated with the size and shape of the brain. But these frequency differences have in themselves a morphological interest.

The fissuration appears slightly greater in the heavier White (German) brains than in the Negro. The pattern also appears more regular in the White brains and perhaps there is more anastromosing of the sulci. Whether these differences would appear in a comparison of Negro and American Whites is problematical, for the average shape of brain would probably be different from the German series.

Herrick, Halstead, Penfield and Rasmussen have each said that the frontal lobes are important; none has claimed that the frontal lobes of the Negro are inferior to the frontal lobes of Whites. Herrick is dead. As a friend with whom he exchanged views on social issues as well as scientific questions, I know that he was not a racist.[6] The views of Halstead, Penfield and Rasmussen are expressed in "Letters to the Editor" of *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine,* Summer 1963. They are quoted here in full:

Dear Sir,

I want to bring to your attention, as a founder and editor of *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine,* a problem which cannot be wholly unfamiliar to you. I refer to some recent attempts to invoke scientific evidence in support of racist dogma of Negro inferiority. One, entitled *The Biology of the Race Problem,* by W. C. George, Emeritus Professor of Anatomy at

[6] One who studies race, or one who believes in significant racial differences, is not necessarily a racist.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the University of South Carolina, was a technical report prepared at the request of the then governor of the state of Alabama. This report was issued in printed form in October 1962.

Another is a book by Carleton Putnam entitled *Race and Reason,* which appeared in 1962 also. Both authors quote my work reported in *Brain and Intelligence* as indicating that the frontal lobes of the brain are of particular significance to the advance of civilization. This is my view, and I am quoted correctly by both of them—but I am quoted in a context which has in some, if not many readers, generated the impression that I subscribe to the views on racism set forth by George and Putnam. I wish to make it clear that this is not the case. It is probably a sound perspective in biology to be extremely wary of the *non-sequitur* involved in generalizing from our limited science of *human-organisms* to value judgments about people. Medicine, through its Hippocratic oath, has ostensibly faced up to this problem long since.

In my opinion, the ghost of racist dogma must be laid to rest before any comprehensive investigation of the important scientific problem posed by race can be undertaken. The emerging disciplines of medical and behavior genetics, for example, are beginning probes that involve a concept of race, but the scientific yield of such efforts will depend directly upon the freedom to make *free* inquiry.[7]

WARD C. HALSTEAD,
Director of Medical Psychology, University of Chicago.

Dear Sir,

In my clinical and pathological work I know of no good evidence of superiority in structure or function of the brain of White or Black, either way. I have the impression (without adequate statistics, it is true) that the Negro skull is thicker on the average than that of the White.

Variations in human capacity have not been directly correlated to differences in brain structure by any clear scientific work as yet. By studying the cytology and the conformation of the human brain, it has been impossible to establish evidence of any generally accepted difference between the genius and the ordinary average man.

It is true that Professor Oscar Vogt, in Germany, did suggest that the man of high intellect has somewhat larger nerve cells in the third layer of the cerebral cortex. He found them larger

[7] The right of making free inquiry is being stifled by the use of terms such as "racist" for anyone who inquires into racial differences.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at autopsy than in the brains of low-grade criminals. He showed that these cells were large, for example, in the case of Lenin, who, I was informed, may have had some oriental as well as European antecedents.

But, on the other hand, no adequate comparative study of the cytology of European, Chinese and African brains has been made to my knowledge. Furthermore, it has been urged that the criminal's brain, as studied by Vogt, was available for fixation and study immediately after death, whereas, in the case of genius, there is invariably a delay of days before the brain is removed for examination. It has been urged, too (Lorente de No), that in the case of the brain of the rabbit, the cells of the third layer appear to enlarge due to some post-mortem alteration if fixation is delayed for a day or two. Further work is needed in regard to this question.

But, in any case, there is no evidence of differences in the brains of white man, black man and yellow man. From other points of view, my own belief is that the innate intellectual capacity of White, Mulatto and Negro is probably the same.

I believe that the brains of the Greek patricians who rose to such superiority of intellectual achievement during the golden age of Classical Greece were no different structurally from the brains of Greeks in the so-called dark ages that followed. The subsequent low level of intellectual output was the result of changing environment, and the disappearance of fair competition, freedom and public rewards for excellence.[8]

WILDER PENFIELD,
Montreal Neurological Institute, Montreal, Canada.

Dear Sir,

I am indeed puzzled as to how any of the physiological observations we have made in our neurosurgical approach to the treatment of certain types of focal epilepsies can be construed to give any evidence one way or the other as to the superiority or inferiority of the brains of one race as compared to another. I know of no data of ours published or unpublished which bears on this question one way or the other.

I would certainly agree with the importance of securing accurate scientific and controlled data on possible genetic differences in brain structure and function, particularly with the

[8] How does he know this? It is more likely that the intellectual decline in Greece was due to the loss of genes for ability rather than to any slight change in environment. Freedom has not necessarily anything to do with genius. If it had we would expect a great flowering of genius from Liberia, or from Haiti after the French left. Genius does not depend on public rewards. If it did, the British Welfare State would show overwhelming evidence of a sharp increase of genius.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

availability of modern neurophysiological and neurochemical tools. I am not aware, however, of any properly controlled study along these lines to date.

THEODORE RASMUSSEN, M.D.,
Montreal Neurological Institute, Montreal, Canada.

The fact that the presently existing evidence for inferiority of the Negro brain is without value does not mean that the brains of Whites and Negroes are identical. It is theoretically possible that, if more refined methods for the study of the structure and chemistry of brains are developed and applied, differences in brain structure and chemistry relating to race can be established. It would be necessary to obtain the brains of healthy adults of good prenatal and postnatal nutrition prior to aging. It is impossible for obvious reasons to obtain representative samples of normal brains.

Similarly, the fact that it has not been possible to prove a genetic basis for racial differences in achievement, drives and aptitudes[9] does not mean that races are genetically equal. My subjective appraisal of the evidence, unsatisfactory as it is, leads me to believe it probable that genetic endowment plays an important rôle in determining racial differences in drives, aptitudes and achievement. If this is true, it is still possible that social injustices are the most important causes of racial inequality.

Each man has beliefs and faiths which extend beyond his knowledge of scientific verities. Some of mine are as follows:

1. I affirm the principle of equal legal and moral rights for individuals regardless of race, and support the right of each individual to be educated and to advance according to his abilities, drives and behavioral standards. Race is not a reliable index of the behavior, abilities and standards of citizenship of the individual.

2. I believe in the voluntary social integration of races when based on compatible abilities, drives and behavioral standards. I oppose equally, forced integration and forced segregation—both are affronts to individual freedom and private judgment; and I oppose the racism in reverse of the forced moving of individuals and groups into jobs, schools and housing because of race alone and without regard to abilities, drives and behavioral standards.

3. I hope for more effective methods than have been advanced by the equalitarians for achieving social justice for all races. I

[9] There is evidence of the inheritance of musical ability, for instance. If there is a widespread musical ability in a particular people it must be assumed that there is a widespread distribution of genes for that ability. Therefore races must differ in the genetic basis of achievement.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

am thinking now of a broad attack upon the causes of crime and incompetence by shifting emphasis to prevention rather than cure. These methods will surely include population control, especially directed at the unfit and incompetent of all races, and a positive eugenics program, with good environment offered to each child from birth. This is not the place to elaborate on methods; all are compatible with private enterprise and would involve applying the same standards to each race.

4. Until it can be proven that intermarriage of Whites and Negroes involves no risk to the future of mankind, I am opposed to it. Although social integration will continue to increase marriage between Whites and Negroes to some extent—almost always the Negro male and the White female—the most frequent mixing of genes is the outcome of the extramarital mating of a Negro female and a White male, a practice which segregationists have not effectively attacked.

5. I would like to see free debate and inquiry on the biology and sociology of race; these should not be set aside in the struggle for social values. The problems will not be resolved by the common position of the mass media of communication, "Negroes good, Whites bad," or by the outcries of bigots of the right and left. Racial bias is real, ugly and powerful, but there are compelling reasons why the average non-Negro does not like to live with the average Negro which have nothing to do with the color of the skin. I believe that these problems can be solved if we search for a hard core of facts and reject the philosophy of some social scientists that truth is shaped by purpose; which is, stated another way, to rationalize beliefs and purposes already held behind a façade of pseudo-science.

All races have contributed to knowledge, discovery and social evolution; some more than others. Good citizenship, competence and leadership can be found among all races. Crime and incompetence can be found within all races. There may be or may not be biological reasons why crime, dependence and incompetence occur more frequently among Negroes than in some other races. But successes and failures are those of individuals, and being a member of a racial group provides neither an ethical nor a biological basis for granting special privileges or denial of civil rights.

Putnam teaches that Negroes should be forcefully segregated and should be deprived of equal civil rights. To support his position, he ignores the extensive overlap in intelligence, drives, accomplishment and citizenship between Whites and Negroes. He has reached firm conclusions that there are important genetic differences between the White and the Negro brain based on worth-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less evidence. It is the mark of the racist to treat all members of an ethnic group as "inferior" without regard for individuality. In my opinion Putnam speaks with the voice of neither reason nor justice.

REFERENCES

Harlow, Harry F. and Margaret Harlow, *Scientific American,* 207: 136, Nov. 1962.

Levine, S., *Acta Endocrinol.* 35: (Suppl. 51) 41, 1960.

Bean, R. B., *Am. J. Anat.* 5: 353, 1906.

Vint, F. W., *J. Anat.* 68: 216, 1934

Connolly, C. J., *External Morphology of the Primate Brain.* Charles C. Thomas, Indianapolis, 1950.

Herrick, C. J., *The Evolution of Human Nature.* University of Texas Press, 1956.

Halstead, W. C., *Brains and Intelligence.* University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Penfield, W. and T. Rasmussen, *The Cerebral Cortex of Man.* The MacMillan Company, 1957.

Mall, F. P., *Am. J. Anat.* 9: 1, 1909.

Putnam, Carleton, *These are the Guilty.* Address before the Washington Putnam Letters Club, Feb. 12, 1963. Printed and distributed by the National Putnam Letters Committee.

Dr Ingle is Professor and Chairman of the Department of Physiology of the University of Chicago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REPLY TO DWIGHT INGLE

By CARLETON PUTNAM

It may be remembered that in the address to which Dr Ingle's paper purports to be an answer I offered the warning: "I urge you in dealing with these people [the equalitarian scientists] to keep them to the point. Their specialty is irrelevance."

I scarcely expected to have so quick and apt an illustration. Ingle quotes letters from Halstead and Penfield on the issue of racial differences in the human brain as if the views of these gentlemen had some bearing on my address. They have none whatever. I cited Penfield and Halstead solely on the importance of the frontal lobes to the more advanced functions involved in our Western civilization—to planning and abstract reasoning, for example—without regard to race. Penfield and Halstead have made no studies of racial differences. It was Bean, Connolly and Vint that I called to testify on such differences, and neither Halstead nor Penfield venture to discuss their investigations.

However, before leaving these letters, a few comments upon them may be in order. Ignoring such evidences of carelessness as the reference to Dr George as Professor Emeritus at the University of *South* Carolina (he was for ten years head of the Department of Anatomy at the Medical School of the University of North Carolina), and a mistake in the publication date of *Race and Reason,* I note in Halstead's letter the regrettable use of the meaningless word "racism" in regard to Dr George and myself. How, one may ask, is any "free inquiry" (which Halstead pretends to champion) to be achieved when any scientist who offers evidence tending to show racial differences is dubbed a racist? The persecution of Carleton Coon for his *Origin of Races,* a badgering by mail and telephone which almost led him to leave the country, ought to be warning enough to men like Halstead as to what dogma needs to be laid to rest before free inquiry can be had.

Turning briefly to Penfield's letter, we find in it the statement that no "adequate" comparative study of European and African brains has been made, but Penfield does not point out in what respect Bean's, Connolly's and Vint's studies are inadequate. His letter suggests that he is not sufficiently familiar with them to do so. It is manifestly absurd to say, as Penfield does, that "there is no evidence of differences in the brains of white man and black man." For reasons which he does not give us, Penfield may not *like* the evidence of Bean, Connolly and Vint, but it is evidence nonetheless.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This leads me to repeat what I said in my address: if equalitarian scientists do not approve the tests so far conducted, most of which indicate *frequency* differences, that is *average* differences, in White and Negro brains, let them conduct tests of their own to disprove them. Ingle suggests that in the nature of things this is impossible, but here he is wrong. With the hundreds of millions of dollars available to them through leftist American foundations, these scientists could easily finance a project controlled to the most exacting taste. However, they have not conducted such tests and will not conduct any. For obvious reasons, they do not dare.

Meanwhile we have, among others, the work of Bean, Connolly and Vint. As I will now proceed to demonstrate, this work has not been seriously challenged in any area which affects the end result, namely, *the overwhelming balance of probability* that racial differences exist in the morphology of the human brain which in turn account for differences in the capacity to adapt to Western civilization. As Dr George has succinctly put it, because the evidence is not *perfect* is no reason for basing a social revolution on the assumption that the opposite of the evidence is true. When the balance of probability here is added to all the evidence from other sciences, the total brings us as close to certainty as any reasonable man can ask. It is, in fact, to use a legal expression, "beyond reasonable doubt."

Let me pause to concede that, while I have a science degree, Ingle is correct in saying I am a "non-scientist" in the sense that I am not a professional scientist. However, a science degree coupled with a law degree give one some ability to weigh the conflicting claims of professional scientists. Let me add, too, that the scientific premises of *Race and Reason* have been endorsed by R. Ruggles Gates, Henry Garrett, Robert Gayre and W. C. George, all of them professional scientists and outstanding leaders in their respective fields of genetics, psychology, ethnology, histology and anatomy. I will venture to say that as far as an analysis of Bean, Connolly and Vint is concerned, George's qualifications and academic status are superior to Ingle's and probably the equal of any scientist's in the country.

Therefore, I make no apology for quoting part of a letter to me from George as regards Ingle's long quotations from Bean and Mall:

> Bean's account of his technical procedure was quoted [by Ingle] apparently for the purpose of discrediting his observations in the reader's mind. Bean was not doing a histological study. His procedures for preservation were routine and adequate for gross anatomical study. Recognizing that some post-mortem changes would occur, it appears that Negro and White brains were subjected to the same general procedures

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the minor mass-changes that might have occurred would cancel each other out for comparative purposes.

As regards the validity of Bean's weights, it can be said that his average is in harmony with that of Vint based on 389 brains weighed fresh with the membranes on; with that of Tilney; with the skull capacity average of 1290 East Africans, estimated by head measurements by Gordon; and with the skull capacity measurements and average reported by Todd for 87 American Negro males.

Furthermore, concerning Mall's failure to confirm Bean's findings of differences in the relative size of the frontal lobes, it is proper to note Connolly's remark that there is a possibility that Mall's material was less representative of the Negro race as no special selection was made of the material and it may have contained mulattoes.

In any case, for frontal lobe differences one can turn to the later studies of Connolly, whom Ingle does not attempt to refute. Connolly indeed says that there is no specific character by which one can distinguish a *single* Negro brain from a White brain but he emphasizes the existence of frequency (average) differences, which is all that I or any other anti-integrationist has claimed. The fact that Connolly was a Catholic working in the highly equalitarian climate of a Catholic institution gives his findings a special force and explains an occasional indirection of style.

As to Ingle's comments on Vint, I again quote George: "According to his reported technical procedures, Dr Vint's technique for handling the brains used for studying the microscopic structure of the cerebral cortex was good, and gives no basis for rejecting his observations." It will be noted that no attempt is made by Ingle to refute Vint's finding of a 14 per cent thinner supragranular layer in Negroes than in Whites. George has emphasized that one cannot attribute differences of this sort to factors which may be expected to affect the brain *as a whole.* Differences in health, for example, or in preservative techniques which might have caused shrinkage, cannot be assumed to have affected the supragranular layer while not affecting other layers, such as the lamina zonalis which in every case proved thicker in the Negro than in the White.

The importance of Vint's studies on the supragranular layer must not be underestimated. This layer is the latest to arise in the evolution of life (and in the embryo) and its relation to the functions of higher civilization are well expressed by George in the following passage:

> When one sees that a fiber tract of the brain is connected with the eyes, it is logical to assume that the tract is concerned with vision. Further observation and experiment show this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion to be correct. Likewise when one traces the pyramidal fibers from the cortex to neurons innervating muscle fibers, it is logical to conclude that they are concerned with muscular activity. Observation and experiment confirm this too. A further general conclusion seems justified, *viz.*, that the anatomical connections of neurons constitute a reliable guide to the part they play in nervous activity—although structure alone does not tell the whole story of function. But whether one deals with the patellar reflex or the blink reflex or any other, or whether one threads a needle, these acts are executed in accordance with the structure of the nervous system. It seems clear that the structure of the nervous system, the integrity of its cells and fibers, is the primary fact in effective nervous activity whether we consider voluntary or involuntary activity.

Since structure is a guide to general function in all those activities that have been adequately analyzed, it would seem rash to disregard structure in any consideration of the higher mental functions. In this connection it seems very significant to me that the cells of the infragranular layer have extensive primary connections with the lower brain centers while the connections of the cells of the supragranular layer are largely intracortical. This is powerful evidence of their primary participation in the special functions of the cortex—the organ of civilization.

Turning now to the manifestations in behavior which we would expect to find from the foundation in structure, we come to Ingle's attacks on the evidence of intelligence tests. Ingle states that in order to "settle the question" it would be necessary to have, first, culture-free tests (he does not explain how a culture-free test could measure the capacity to adapt to a culture); second, studies of representative samples of White and Negro populations (these have been made repeatedly); third, replication of the studies by different designs and methods (there have been 240 studies over the last 40 years), and finally debate and criticism of methods and results with exclusion of other plausible hypotheses (this has likewise occurred—the favorite other-hypothesis excuse of unequal socio-economic background has been answered by Garrett in the *American Psychologist* for May 1962 by showing that there have been six studies on the subject and all of them indicate that the equating of socio-economic background does not change the results).

Finally Ingle interlards his paper with frequent references to "civil rights," apparently forgetting that there was no "right" on the part of the Negro to forced integration with Whites until the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the *Brown* case, and that in May

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this year a federal judge found that the evidence in the *Brown* case was misrepresented by the chief witness—that in fact it proved the exact opposite of what that witness said it proved.

I will go further and say that 90 per cent of the available evidence was never even offered to the Court in *Brown,* making the distortion of the remainder all the more reprehensible. This throws wide open the question of the technical existence of any legal right under *Brown.* As far as any *moral* right is concerned, I can imagine nothing less moral than forcing a White Southern mother against her will to put her children in school with a race which the balance of evidence today indicates to be thousands of years behind the White race in evolutionary status.

Ingle speaks of the existence of overlap as if this justified integration. Here he discloses a singular lack of experience with the practical world. As George has expressed it, "if we open the doors to areas of Caucasian social life where mates are chosen to select Negroes of high merit, we also open them in the end to millions of inferior individuals. If we allow ourselves to be deceived by that Trojan horse, we may expect a fate similar to that of ancient Troy." Recent behavior of Negroes in demanding massive integration and attempting to enforce those demands by violence should convince the most gullible.

In his credo at the end, Ingle says that he equally opposes forced integration and forced segregation; he does not explain how, in a community where the Whites insist on segregation and the Blacks on integration, it is possible to avoid force against one or the other. His approach is again utterly visionary, because even in a community which could afford to maintain three sets of schools, the integrated school would fail to meet the Negro's demand for a "balanced" attendance. But since Ingle indulges so freely in his political views I will close with a few of my own.

I believe that racial tensions have been dangerously increased by the false teachings of scientists on the subject of racial equality. These teachings have deceived the average Negro about himself and his capacities; they have led him to expect the impossible and to price and class himself out of those areas where he is best qualified to serve, which in part accounts for his high ratio of unemployment. Still worse, they have led him to suppose he has a grudge against the White man when the truth is he owes the white man a greater debt than he can ever repay. The result may well be uncontrollable violence on both sides, especially since justice is on the side of the Whites.

I believe in giving the average Negro all the jobs he is qualified to perform and in not being surprised if, as predicted by intelligence tests, he is not found in the higher echelons of our industrial complex.

I believe with Ingle that environment plays a significant part

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in determining the performance of individuals and races, but I disagree with his statement that it plays the major part. I believe Garrett is correct when he estimates that environment accounts for about 25 per cent, and genetic endowment about 75 per cent, of this performance. Garrett's estimate is confirmed by the eminent Professor of Psychology, Sir Cyril Burt, of the University of London.

I believe that those scientists who have deceived the Negro about himself by weakly drifting with the leftist current of the day, or by evasions, double talk or silence, should be held to strict accountability by the American people. I believe that those scientists who have risked their livelihood and their peace of mind by stating the truth in the face of persecution should be given the Medal of Honor.

I believe that the ideology of the far left is the ideology of theft, in the sense that it consists in finding legal means of stealing from those who have earned and/or conserved and squandering upon those who have neither earned nor conserved. The process can be applied to both money and culture, to both individuals and races. I believe that politicians who buy the votes of Negroes by offering to support them in the invasion and corruption of the culture of Whites should be retired from office.

As long as no satisfactory method of complete separation of the races can be devised, I believe in integration in non-social situations such as public places—subject to local decision as to what, in any given community, a social situation is. This will be difficult to achieve now that the *Brown* case has inflamed tempers in the South.

Last and most important, I believe in the immediate and unqualified reversal of *Brown*. The finding of the federal judge in the *Stell* case (Savannah, May 1963) is that integration damages *the Negro* as well as the White child, a fact which should interest every sincere humanitarian.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NOTE ON THE REACTIONS OF A FAMILY LIVING IN A FALLOUT SHELTER

By HENRY H. REITER

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the relevant psychological variables associated with a family of four living in a fallout shelter exhibit. A secondary purpose was to discover the salient human factor problems encountered as a result of the family living in the shelter for seven days. It was undertaken only after a model of a fallout shelter was installed at Roosevelt Field, Long Island, New York, primarily to demonstrate to the public the importance of fallout protection. While the shelter was designed to be installed underground, the shelter employed in the present study was installed above the ground as a temporary unit.

This family of four was not studied under simulated conditions of nuclear attack. This was merely an exploratory study to observe what problems would occur when a family was placed in relative social isolation for one week. The investigation involved the use of certain psychological tests which the husband and wife were asked to complete before, during, and after the shelter experience.

METHOD

The subjects in the study consisted of a twenty-nine-year-old male, a twenty-five-year-old female, and their two sons aged three and five. The married couple had volunteered for the experiment with the promise of a $500 reward upon completion of the week in the shelter.

The husband and wife were administered the following psychological instruments according to a pre-arranged schedule:

1. Thematic Apperception Test (T.A.T.), administered the day before and the day after the fallout shelter experience.

2. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (M.M.P.I.), administered on the first and seventh days in the shelter.

3. Mooney Problem Checklist, administered on the second and the fifth day inside the shelter.

4. Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank, administered three and six days after the start of the experience.

5. Machover Figure-Drawings, administered four and seven days after the start of the study.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to the psychological tests administered before, during and after the fallout shelter experience, interviews were given the day before, on the final day, and the day after the experience. Daily diaries were assigned to the two adults, with specific instructions to work independently, according to a specific format. Emphasis was placed on emotional and somatic conditions of the adults, interpersonal relationships amongst the four members of the family, and specific dislikes about the shelter conditions. No tests were administered to the two sons because of their ages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study are presented in order to indicate trends and identify variables associated with fallout shelter living. The results relate only to the family studied, and it will be noted that, since the shelter was on exhibit to the public for several hours each day, the fallout shelter living was in no way related to conditions of underground living with social isolation.

The results of the various psychological tests indicated that there was a marked increase in hysterical complaints and persecutory ideation, as measured by the M.M.P.I. The hysterical complaints were seen as an increase in physical discomfort as a result of cramped quarters. A general increase in emotionality was indicated in both the husband and wife, as measured by the T.A.T., the Mooney Problem Checklist, and the Sentence-Completion Blank. The daily structured diaries provided some verification of the increase in emotionality as the seven-day experience approached its end.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As a result of studying the reactions of a family of four living in a fallout shelter exhibit for seven days, it was found that there was an increase in emotionality over the seven-day period. Physical discomfort, social problems and general anxiety seemed to be manifestations of the seven-day experience, as measured by several psychological tests.

Further research is necessary to identify the salient variables associated with actual fallout shelter living.

Studies of this kind applied to different ethnic groups might yield interesting comparative results.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

CELTIC HERITAGE: ANCIENT TRADITION IN ENGLAND AND WALES

By Alwyn Rees and Brinley Rees. Thames and Hudson, London, 1961. Pp. 427, 14 figures. Price 50s.

The authors are respectively Director of Extra-Mural Studies at the University College of Wales, and Lecturer in Welsh Language and Literature at the University College of North Wales.

This book sets out to give a new interpretation of Celtic tradition in the light of new knowledge gained in the fields of anthropology, comparative religion and mythology. The authors consider that the ancient poets and story tellers have been vindicated, although earlier they were dismissed as monkish tales and bogus history. Many of these traditional themes are demonstrated to be survivals from pre-Christian Celtic times.

Under the heading "Branches of the Tradition" the authors deal with traditional Irish Tales, which comprise four groups—the Mythological, Ulster, Fenian and Historical cycles.

The authors point out (pp. 52 and 53) that the name of the mythical Danann of Ireland is related to the name Dôn, a bye-form of Donwy, and both are related to the name of a goddess, Dānu, who figures in the Rig Veda. *Dānu* means "stream" and "the waters of heaven," meanings which are close to the Celtic meanings of the word, and the same root is found in the "Don" names of rivers which are found from the British Isles to Russia.

The authors do not look on the series of legendary invasions of Ireland as possibly being traditions from ancient folk memory of actual invading peoples (such as the Fir Bolg, Tuatha Dé Danann and so on) as much as the broken fragmentary and distorted mythology of the ancient Celts. They relate this mythology to that of India, and see a common Aryan origin. The five settling peoples they see as the equivalents of the aborigines and the four Hindu castes. In which case it is evident, if they are right in their interpretation, that the basis of what was to become the caste-system of India, and its relationship to the non-caste aborigines, had already been evolved before the dispersion of the Aryans from their original homeland and their division into the two great groups of Centum and Satem (or Western and Eastern) Aryans. This view is tenable if we assume that the lowest and fourth caste was already of non-Aryan origin at this remote period, since we know in Irish mythology the division of society which the authors look upon as the equivalent of the lowest Indian caste was already considered to be dark—whereas in contrast even the third group (equivalent of the third Hindu caṣte) is described as golden haired.

If this is correct comparative rationalisation of Celtic mythology in relation to Hindu, then that racial consciousness which ultimately developed into the caste system of India as we know it today already existed in the undivided Aryan hordes before they dispersed, when they had only made contact with neighbouring peoples of other Caucasoid races, and before they had really come into contact with coloured peoples at all. As a result, the outcome of their ultimate impact with the aborigines of India ("the noseless ones," *i.e.*, the broad nosed Negroid-Australoids) merely intensified the developing caste system. Whereas earlier Caucasoid con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quests had merely resulted in the conquered peoples becoming lower castes, now on contact with non-whites this solution was no longer possible and so we get the caste Hindus—divided into four castes—and those outside the caste system—segregated from the people of caste rank. This view is supported by the fact that the word *varna,* caste, also means colour.

From this we are led to conclude that a form of horizontal social segregation would appear to occur naturally, so that each social class within any linguistic and national entity tends to represent a particular type, even where the whole group belongs to one general racial origin (such as Caucasoid), while a more marked segregation arises in addition to this class structure (which often has genetic and ethnological significance) when the whole group comes into contact with quite distinct racial types. Even where, as a result of a multi-racial situation (such as in India), the alien elements (such as the aboriginals) are more or less acculturated to the ways of the dominant social group (in this case the Hindus) they are never absorbed into it but survive as an outcaste group beneath caste level.

The caste system, if we follow our authors, is thus very old, and must go back 10,000 years at least till the division of Centum and Satem Aryans. When the caste system comes into contact with radically different racial stocks it hardens into outright colour bar. The colour problems of our time are, therefore, no modern phenomenon, and the way a *modus vivendi* has been established in the past, as India shows, is by segregation.

HUMAN HEREDITY

By Ashley Montagu. Mentor Books, New York, 1961. Pp. 364. Price $0.75.

This book, described by the *New York Times* as "comprehensive and well-documented," purports to provide an overview for the intelligent layman of the ways in which heredity determines one's physical and mental traits as well as such characteristics as sex and race. The first 11 chapters on the genetic mechanisms are clearly written and are, for the most part, accurate; Part II also contains much good material. It is only when he discusses race that Montagu shows how far afield the bias of the dedicated equalitarian can go. Perhaps it is enough of a clue to note that Montagu was the author of the notorious first UNESCO statement on race.

On page 114, Montagu shrugs off the well established I.Q. differences, found over the past 50 years, between Negro and White children in the United States. He quotes with full approval Klineberg's studies in which the test scores of Negro migrants to New York city were reported to rise with residence in the city; and he applauds Passamanick's New Haven study in which Negro and White babies were shown to do equally well on simple physical tests. This "evidence" is taken to mean that environment accounts for all racial differences in intelligence. Montagu fails to add that Klineberg's work has been completely refuted and that the correlation between baby-tests and later abstract tests of intelligence at school age is zero. Nor does he note that the chimpanzee will perform many of these tests better than either racial group owing to its accelerated growth rate.

In Section II (pp. 182-197) under the caption "Heredity and 'Race'" Montagu gives one of the most one-sided accounts of racial differences in mental abilities to be found anywhere in the literature—despite some rather good pictures. Montagu prints race in quotes to emphasize the idea (held by some of the Boas group) that such entities as races do not exist. He later proceeds to mix races and national groups *ad lib.* The argument throughout is cleverly *ad hominem* and is strictly specious. Race

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crossing is said never to be harmful; Davenport revealed his "prejudice" in finding racial differences in his Jamaican studies. Even the Australian aborigines (one of the most backward races) have been "largely prevented from realizing their magnificent potential by discrimination. . . ." As evidence for this preposterous statement, Montagu quotes the narrative account of superior learning among aborigines (thoroughly discredited by Porteus) reported by a minister some 50 years ago.

This book cannot be recommended except as an example of how far science can be prostituted to equalitarian ends.

HENRY E. GARRETT.

HUMAN HEREDITY

By C. O. Carter. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1962. Pp. 266, 72 figures, 4 plates. Price 6s.

Dr Cedric Carter, a member of the staff of the Medical Research Council, does research into the genetics of children's diseases. He is interested in the genetics of *normal* qualities of social importance. Consequently his book, *Human Heredity*, is free from some of the faults of Penrose's *Outline*. The arrangement of matter is more balanced, congenital deformities being kept to the end without loss of clarity in the argument.

The author has more room to devote to the geographical distribution of blood group genes and thus to a consideration of racial differences. With as many as 72 figures Carter has brought more factual information to the reader's notice than Penrose's unfortunately constricted account. He not only deals with variations in human genetics in space but also in time.

Carter, a past general secretary of the Eugenics Society, makes observations which might be useful in social planning, *e.g.*, in education and the health services where inequalities in genetic endowment are now widely recognised, though they are somewhat timidly presented. It is difficult perhaps to avoid "Brave New Worldism" in looking to the future of certain aspects of eugenics. *Human Heredity* is remarkable value for money and much wider in scope than Penrose's book. It is significant, however, that Eysenck is quoted but not Weyl. When the whole of human personality comes to be studied genetically a better book than either of these will be possible.

R. H. S. R.

THE ANCIENT WORLDS OF ASIA: FROM MESOPOTAMIA TO THE YELLOW RIVER

By Ernst Diez. Translated by W. C. Darwell from the French version by Louis Mézeray. Macdonald, London, 1961. Pp. 240, 13 plates, 4 maps. Price 30s.

The fifteen disconnected chapters of this book deal with so many ancient sites or cities, ranging from Sialk, Ur, Babylon and Persepolis to Mount Meru, An-yang and Qumran. The author quotes extensively from ancient chronicles, and from travellers such as Layard, Chardin and Lecoq. There is no connecting thread in the book, and if read through by a beginner it would leave a very confused impression of Asian chronology and geography. But for light reading each chapter could be considered separately. The text is informative, and is enlivened by thirteen photographs of scenes or artistic creations.

W. C. BRICE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDIAN LIFE IN THE UPPER GREAT LAKES: 11,000 B.C. TO A.D. 1800

By George Irving Quimby. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960: Cambridge University Press, London, 1961. Pp. 182, 75 figures. Price 48s.

This work by the Curator of North American Archaeology and Ethnology at Chicago Natural History Museum deals with the prehistory of the Upper Great Lakes of America from the end of the Ice Age approximately 12,000 years ago. The author discusses the earliest stone age inhabitants who flowed into the region on the retreat of the glaciers, those of the Old Copper culture, and those of the Late Woodland period, about 800 A.D.

The ice retreat in this region began about 13,000 to 12,000 years ago, but until about 9000 years ago a Continental glacier was the dominant feature in the geography of this region. By about 6000 B.C. it had given way to leave a region of waters, of which the Great Lakes remain to the present time.

The natives of this region, in the author's opinion, had boats as early as 7000 B.C. Following the retreat of the ice came the people who used fluted points of chipped stone, then hunters with lanceolate blades, then the ancient boreal folk with woodworking tools of ground stone, and ultimately the Old Copper Indians, who made their tools and weapons of copper. It was not, however, until about 100 B.C. that agriculturists came to this region.

The writer considers that the Old Copper Indians were not only the first fabricators of metal in the Americas but perhaps in the world—and he dates them as far back as 4000 to 5000 B.C. On the other hand they worked the metal as though it were stone—smelting and casting were unknown to them—so they were not true metallurgists at all. Their economy was based on hunting and so they were not truly in a neolithic stage of development.

Racially these people had long heads with moderately high vaults and some saggital cresting, narrowish faces, and tall stature. They appear to have had dogs and used spears, and they probably had spear-throwers. They also used boats.

These folk appear to have moved northwards with the retreating ice, and the discovery of Indians and Eskimos using hammered copper artefacts as late as the eighteenth century suggests that the culture may well have survived in some respects in the far north till historic times.

They were succeeded by the folk of the Early Woodland Culture which, in this region, appears to have been at its fullest development between 500 and 100 B.C. They apparently had no agriculture and their only domestic animals were dogs. We have to turn to the Hopewell Indian culture (dated from 500 B.C. to 500 A.D.) which occupied the eastern seaboard of the United States before we come upon agriculturists. By 100 B.C. these people had entered the upper Great Lakes region. Although agriculturists, their only domesticated animal was the dog. They appear, however, to have engaged in relatively widespread trade.

With these Indians we begin to get people of shorter and stockier stature, with skulls ranging from long to medium breadth. If the figurines they have left behind are to be trusted their faces were oval with slant eyes.

The usual explanation for the occurrence of brachycephaly in America as in Europe is that it was due to a mutation which gradually spread through these populations. This reviewer has never held that view and believes it is due to crossing with neighbouring brachycephalic stocks from Asia. In this instance the probability is that an original Australoid (Ainuoid) stock which entered America from Asia, and amalgamated with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a Caucasoid (Chancelade) strain from Europe, later received further Mongoloid infiltrations from Asia which brought about a shortening of stature, stockier frames, broader skulls, and some Mongoloid influence in the eyes. It is significant that all this occurs in a people whose pottery shows a remote relationship with Asia, and who are known to have engaged widely in trade. This accounts for the fact that in the Amerinds of America, from place to place, one can trace segregating out of characters which are Caucasoid, Australoid and Mongoloid. The "red skin" associated with the Amerind can be found elsewhere in the world, and it is probably due to crossing between several stocks There is a wide range of variation in the colour of skin of the Amerinds as we would expect on the basis of this explanation. Meanwhile, with the passing of time, selection appears to have favoured the Mongoloid traits. As a result they have increased with the passage of time.

This culture was followed by the Late Woodland cultures, which in this region are dated from 800 to 1600 A.D., whose people seem to have been racially akin to their predecessors, with short stocky build and relatively long skulls.

The author brings the history of these peoples down to the nineteenth century. Quimby is a master of his subject and has given a clear, useful and authoritative account of the archaeology of this region of America.

R. GAYRE OF GAYRE.

INDIAN ANTHROPOLOGY: ESSAYS IN MEMORY OF D. N. MAJUMDAR

Edited by T. N. Madan and Gopāla Sarana. Asia Publishing House, London, 1962. Pp. 420. Price 60s.

This book is dedicated to the memory of a well known Indian anthropologist—Professor D. N. Majumdar of the University of Lucknow—who played an important part in training many of the modern anthropologists of India. Part I deals with the life and work of Dr Majumdar, and Part II (the main part of the book) is devoted to essays by anthropologists on topics of Indian anthropology ranging from prehistory to physical and socio-cultural anthropology. Among the contributions is a paper by the late Professor R. Ruggles Gates on the Asurs and Birhors of Chota Nagpur. There is also a paper by A. E. Mourant, "Notes on Blood Groups in India," and there is one on the same subject by Bird, Ikin, Mourant and Lehmann entitled "The Blood Groups and Haemoglobins of the Malayalis." S. S. Sarkar has contributed a paper on dermatoglyphics in India, P. G. Shah writes on racial surveys in Gujarat, D. K. Sen on the racial composition of Bengalis, and C. Radhakrishna Rao on anthropometric surveys. In addition there are numerous other papers on the social and cultural aspects of Indian anthropology.

The article by B. Subbarao, "Archaeology and Anthropology in India," is not only interesting but raises many problems in the analysis of Indian ethnology.

OUTLINE OF HUMAN GENETICS

By L. S. Penrose. Heinemann, London, Melbourne and Toronto, second edition, 1963. Pp. 166, 21 figures, 9 tables, 6 plates. Price 15s.

As we may expect from the author of the *Biology of Mental Defect* 1953), much more is said in this book about the transmission of rare defects than of useful healthy characters. Indeed it is difficult to write on what

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is known about human genetics without presenting an almost terrifying array of details about mongolism, anencephaly, ectodactyly and some of the other gross malformations. Nevertheless Professor Penrose has contrived in these few pages to be extremely clear in his definitions and descriptions of the principles and modes of inheritance. The *Outline of Human Genetics* understandably attains a second edition because it contains some of the clearest definitions readily available of the concepts of genetics. One may particularly mention the principle of segregating and non-segregating characters, the nature and functions of genes and chromosomes, of dominant and recessive characters, of incompletely recessive characters, and of the *Rhesus* system, and the Hardy-Weinberg law governing the effect of random mating on gene frequency. Chapters on association and linkage and on the interplay of environment and heredity are also for the most part admirably expressed.

Professor Penrose is right to call attention to the treacherous nature of twin studies as "evidence" of the relative influence of environment and heredity, but one cannot help feeling that he is only too ready to throw the baby out with the bath water. In the chapter on eugenics and dysgenics Penrose fails to uphold the tradition of Galton, although he holds the Galton Professorship of Eugenics at University College, London; he seems to go too far in playing down the useful effect of assortative mating in our civilisation, except at the moronic end of the scale: "it is interesting to note that the moronic tenth, by its high fertility, helps to supplement the normal population . . . and the genetical backbone of the population is, in fact, the despised mentally inferior tenth." Although he says that this gene model should not be taken too seriously, it is clear that he fails to conceal behind his scientific objectivity a very strong dislike of those who wish to preserve through assortative mating certain characters which they hold to be valuable, or those who unconsciously succeed in preserving valuable breeding stocks within a wider population, or those who are concerned with the quality of human beings—even though the world's population explosion is a problem of immense importance.

R. H. S. R.

THE WORLD OF ARCHAEOLOGY: INDIA, CHINA, AMERICA

By Marcel Brion. Translated from the French by Miriam and Lionel Kochan. Elek Books, London, 1961. Pp. 240, 23 plates, 30 figures. Price 42s.

The author has a taste for the more bizarre and romantic aspects of archaeological work and theory. There are prefatory chapters about the methods and principles of excavation, and illustrations in subsequent chapters from early India and China, and the higher Amerindian civilizations. M. Brion has read widely, and can recall and recount the more exciting and memorable of his facts and stories with an infectious enthusiasm. What is lacking is first of all a direct experience of these places and activities, and secondly a sound and authoritative critical sense. For example, the significance of the "Ring of Minos" in Cretan discovery is oddly exaggerated (page 30), and the thing was a forgery anyhow. Again, the somewhat peripheral theory of a link between the Indus Valley and Easter Island scripts (pages 115-116) should in fairness be set against other ideas. In short this is a stimulating and informative book in respect of both text and illustrations, but it is in no sense an authoritative work.

W. C. BRICE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ISLAND CIVILIZATIONS OF POLYNESIA

By Robert G. Suggs. Mentor Books, New York, 1960. Pp. 256. Price $0.50.

The young archaeologist and ethnologist, Robert Suggs, describes in this volume the origin and development of the Polynesian island cultures in a fresh and plain, but yet strongly scientific, style. Moreover, he supports his conclusions with the results of his own and other archaeological excavations. The outcome is an enchanting little volume, supported by the youthful enthusiasm and still fresh memories of his numerous trips to these distant and beautiful islands.

Unfortunately Suggs treats the present (or at least the only recently destroyed) spiritual culture, especially the religion, with very little detail. However, this may have its basis in the predominantly natural science training of the author. Thus, in his contacts with the Polynesian natives, little else is forthcoming. Much better and more clearly described are the course of settlement (from archaeological finds and also C-14 datings) and the ocean voyage traditions. (Regarding the latter, Heyerdahl is clearly but politely discarded).

In addition to the footnotes given in the text, the author has compiled a good bibliography at the end of the book.

This is truly a delightful little volume which can be read only with pleasure.

BERTIL LUNDMAN *trans. Donald A. Swan.*

ASPECTS OF RELIGION IN INDIAN SOCIETY

Edited by L. P. Vidyarthi. Kedar Nath Ram Nath, Meerut, 1961. Pp. 410. Price Rs 18.00.

This collection of essays is dedicated to the memory of the late Professor D. N Majumdar, Professor of Anthropology at Lucknow University. Professor Majumdar was primarily a social anthropologist, although he made excursions into the field of physical anthropology from time to time. It is therefore fitting that a book in his honour should be concerned more with the social than the racial aspects of his field of studies.

This book, which is edited by Dr L. P. Vidyarthi, Head of the Department of Anthropology at Ranchi University, comprises 21 papers written by social scientists. It attempts to analyse India's personality as portrayed through her folk beliefs, rituals, feasts, etc., and it presents accounts of Hinduism, Sikhism and Islam, as well as of the tribal religions.

R. S. Srivastava's paper, "The Chief Currents of Contemporary Indian Philosophy," deals with the evolution of supermen or gnostic beings (p. 33): "The animal has evolved into man and the man is to be transformed into the Superman."

A. Aiyappan, in his paper "Thinking About the Hindu Way of Life," says that if the significance of some of the seals and figurines of the Indus Valley civilization of 5000 years ago is correctly interpreted they indicate that Yoga was in existence at that time.

K. N. Sharma discusses Hindu sects and food patterns in North India. He divides the Brahmans into vegetarian and meat- and fish-eating sections, of which the latter are in a minority. He also quotes Srinivas as saying that low castes today can get themselves received as Brahmans after several generations by becoming vegetarians and Sanskritising their ritual. This, no doubt, has also happened in the past, and it accounts for the seepage of darker complexions into the higher castes—although these are still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markedly lighter than the lower castes. K. N. Sharma has given his readers a clear and useful account of the otherwise very complex relationships of Hindu sects.

G. M. Carstairs, in "Patterns of Religious Observance in Three Villages of Rajasthan," draws attention (p. 59) to the fact "that the Aryan precursors of modern high-caste Hindus found a savage, short-statured, dark-skinned race of peoples living in the jungles, and that these peoples' worship was all of demons and local godlings. The concept of the elect and the barbarians has been incorporated into the caste structure of Hinduism, and every high-caste Hindu considers it quite natural that the Sudras should have primitive and unenlightened cults of their own." Actually the barbarians may have been below the Sudra level, and may only have been absorbed into it after conquest and acculturation.

The author of this section of the book is quite right in drawing attention to the fact that in Vedic times the religion of the Aryan Hindus was of a different character than that now found in Hinduism. He says (p. 60): "It now appears that the orthodox Hinduism of today is vastly different from the religion of the first Aryan conquerors . . . they were a robust, carnal, warrior-people, taking pleasure in feasting and drinking, and apt for love." Carstairs is probably correct in attributing much of modern Hindu orthodoxy to the values and ideas of the Indus Valley civilization (of Mediterranean-Armenoid racial provenance) which the Aryans conquered and absorbed. He looks to the Indus Valley religions for the origin of Shiva and the phallic symbol.

In a note to G. M. Carstairs' article, Professor David G. Mandelbaum says (p. 112) that there is no evidence that the Vedic people came from anywhere other than the Panjab. Although an oft repeated statement by one school of thought this is a manifest absurdity. Who is going to say that the widespread Aryan civilization stretching from the West of Europe to Iran and India came from the Panjab? Since the Vedic peoples were Aryans they had their roots in such centre of distribution as is common to all the Aryans—that is anywhere from the Ukraine to east of the Urals and north of the Himalayas.

These comments on this book will indicate the interesting problems raised by just the few papers mentioned—which may be taken as samples of the whole.

R. GAYRE OF GAYRE AND NIGG.

THE DESEGREGATION OF SOUTHERN SCHOOLS: A PSYCHIATRIC STUDY

By Robert Coles. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, 1963. Pp. 25. Price $0.50.

This sympathetically written brochure is important because it is among the first of the psychiatric studies devoted to assessing the impact of desegregation of the schools upon the Negro and White children of the South. The psychiatric interviews involved something like sixty Negro children in two groups, one composed of children between the ages of six and seven and the other of adolescents of sixteen and seventeen. The work was conducted in Atlanta and New Orleans over a two year period. The importance of work of this kind in our times of interracial crisis need not be argued.

The conclusions of the author, then, are of compelling interest. Of the Negro children congregated with Whites in various contact situations he writes, "[the Negroes'] attendance in [White schools] is stressful but not incapacitating" (p. 6). Of the White children studied, he writes, "None

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the white children seen have suffered any medical or psychiatric damage . . ." (p. 9). The tone of the account is sanguine and a qualified endorsement of the social experiment precipitated by the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

Unfortunately this substantial and fascinating account is impaired by a methodological limitation of significant consequence. The author's conclusions must be qualified by his admission that his sample was apparently non-representative. The relatively few Negro children integrated in New Orleans and Atlanta were those who had initiated court actions and "those Negro children who initiate court ordered desegregation in the South are likely to be different from their peers on several accounts. Their very selection often recommends them as more intelligent or without emotional disorders which are grossly visible" (p. 4). Being a select group it is hardly surprising that the author found that the Negro children met the academic requirements of the White schools and that only one Negro child suffered serious psychological difficulties (pp. 5, 22 f.). Once this is understood the author's apparent suggestion that integration can proceed without fear of impairing the intellectual and moral standards of the hitherto White school or classroom (". . . we have yet to hear a southern teacher complain of any drop in intellectual or moral climate in a desegregated room or school," p. 23) is not quite as convincing as it might otherwise have been.

The fact is that at the time the author was pursuing his work less than one per cent of the Negro children in the "hard core" Southern States had been "integrated." Those that had gained entrance into White schools were non-representative of their race. It would have been most unusual had there been any impairment in the educaional or moral standards prevalent in the hitherto White schools under consideration. The author neglects to indicate how far above the mean of their race the Negro subjects actually were. A representative sample of 1800 Negro elementary school children in the South-eastern United States indicates that their mean I.Q. was 80.7 (S.D. 12.4) (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Project 954*, September 1960 to December 1961, p. 4). Should *massive* integration be undertaken it is difficult to imagine that the educational requirements would not have to be reduced to accord with the reduced efficiency of the new group. Just such a fear of reduced educational opportunities in the neighborhood schools has been, in fact, the prime cause of White middle-class evacuation from "integrated" residential areas (*cf.* S. Fauman, "Housing Discrimination, Changing Neighborhoods and Public Schools," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, 1957, pp. 21-30).

That the author was concerned with desegregation in Atlanta and New Orleans where there has been minimal "integration" probably explains why ht heard no southern teacher complain of a "drop in intellectual or moral climate." For certainly there has been a chorus of just such complaints from Washington, D.C., which was to have been a model for desegregation (*cf.* Investigation of Public School Conditions: Hearings before the Subcommittte to Investigate Public School Standards and Conditions and Juvenile Delinquency in the District of Columbia of the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Eighty-fourth Congress, Second Session, 1956).

Every social scientist knows that the Negro subculture in the United States is beset by problems which conduce to juvenile delinquency and impaired academic proficiency. That general integration of large numbers of the representatives of this subculture should not reduce the efficiency or impair the moral climate of educational institutions particularly in the South, where the Negro deficits are largest, defies comprehension.

This brief work is important. Any work in this vexed area is important. But in these times of stress the community has a right to a full and balanced

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appraisal if it is to meet the problems which social change will bring in its train. Only by preparing itself with a sensitive awareness of *all* the facts can increased tension and serious educational dislocation be forestalled.

A. JAMES GREGOR.

LE RAZZE E I POPOLI DELLA TERRA

By Renato Biasutti, with the collaboration of Raffaello Battaglia and others. Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, Turin, 1959. Vol. I, *Races, Peoples and Cultures*; Vol. II, *Europe and Asia*; Vol. III, *Africa*; and Vol. IV, *Oceania and America*. Pp. 2,920, 43 colour plates, 2,032 illustrations, 131 maps. Price 37,000 Lire.

Anthropologists who examine a somewhat older anthropological book collection and glance at the numerous, often comprehensive and, for their time, good anthropological survey works (as, for example, those of Keane, Haddon, Brinton, Mueller, Deniker, Schurtz, and others), become painfully conscious of the lack of similar works in recent years. Since about 1920 anthropological books in English, German and French have appeared only with limited objectives. They have been either purely (or almost purely) physical-anthropological in nature, such as those by Egon von Eickstedt and M. F. Ashley Montagu, or purely ethnographical in nature, such as those by Dittmer, Buschan, Bernatzik, Linton and others. In addition, numerous "college books" (mostly only introductory) have been published which almost always exhibit a more or less unsystematic, or at best a somewhat "pedagogical," arrangement. There is, however, no comprehensive description of all ethnic and racial groups in which each subject is assigned its proper place.

For those readers who have some command of Italian—and with the advance of Italy in almost all scientific fields their numbers will gradually increase—Professor Biasutti's four volumes constitute in every respect an outstanding, reliable and beautiful work. Although scientifically reliably based throughout, the presentation is easily accessible to all educated people because of its elegance and clarity. The physical production of the four volumes, including the binding, paper, maps, tables and textual illustrations, is truly magnificent. The bibliography and the index likewise meet the highest standards. On the whole this work will satisfy everyone—from the cultured layman to the anthropological-ethnographic specialist.

Professor Biasutti, who was Professor of Anthropology at the University of Florence, has written nearly two-thirds of the work himself, and he has arranged the remainder with great skill. Professor Biasutti was originally a geographer, which has probably facilitated the clear arrangement of the work. Especially worthy of praise is the chapter on palaeo-anthropology (covering both the earth as a whole, and each continent separately), which for the most part was written by Biasutti himself, and which, in my opinion, surpasses all such efforts in other collected works. Perhaps readers of THE MANKIND QUARTERLY will miss the racio-psychological discussions—the little that is contained in the introduction is *very* cautious. However, that is largely made necessary in the case of such a great and comprehensive work as Biasutti's by the lack of original empirical research. In any event, such an anthropological classic as Professor Biasutti's *Le Razze e i Populi della Terra* should at least be translated into English—there is little doubt that it would find many readers.

BERTIL LUNDMAN, *trans.* DONALD A. SWAN.

Macdonald Printers (Edinburgh) Limited
1 & 2 Richmond Lane, Edinburgh 8

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A monthly book review journal covering literature in all fields of psychology

CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY

EDWIN G. BORING Editor

The journal contains critical evaluative reviews of outstanding books in psychology prepared by specialists in their particular fields

Other features: INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA, a department that gives valuable information on all phases of educational films; CP SPEAKS, the editor's page of news and comments on developments in the psychological book world; and ON THE OTHER HAND, a section reserved for comment and criticism by the journal's readers

Subscription rate: $10.00 (Foreign $10.50). Single issue: $1.00

Send your subscription to

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

1333 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., U.S.A.

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Per single issue—6/- a copy ($1.25); annual subscription (4 issues)—£1.1.0 ($4.00); three year subscription (12 issues)—£3 ($11.00). Post free by surface mail. Copies will be sent by air mail on payment of 5/- ($0.75) for each copy ordered, additional to the above payments. No responsibility can be accepted for copies lost in the post after dispatch.

Subscription Offices:

102 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

CONTRIBUTIONS

Contributors to THE MANKIND QUARTERLY are requested to forward three copies of all matter submitted for publication. A short biographical note and a suitable photograph should also be included.

Editorial Offices:

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH 3, SCOTLAND

The Editors do not accept responsibility for the views expressed by individual contributors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

At no time in our history has the need for higher education been greater: at no time has the demand been more insistent, or the requirements more exacting. The scope and content of many aspects of scientific learning has more than doubled in the course of a generation; and with the growth of science a corresponding efficacy in the processes of general and humane education has become essential.

The University of Edinburgh, conscious of the immensity and responsibility of its task, is painfully aware that its physical assets, in the shape of laboratories, classrooms, ancillary accommodation, and the necessary equipment, are inadequate and out of date.

These things cost money. Though much will be provided from Government sources, the University itself will have to meet the cost of a substantial part of its building programme, which, over the next few years, will involve the expenditure of many millions of pounds. To this end it is making an Appeal to all its graduates and friends, and has already raised more than £500,000. Still more is required if our young men and women are to have the education they desire and deserve.

All contributions will be most gratefully acknowledged, and full information on the University's needs and plans, with advice on methods of contributing, will gladly be sent on application to the Secretary to the University, Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh, 8.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED